THE AUTHORSHIP OF 'PIERS PLOWMAN.'

THE controversy as to the authorship of the different versions of *Piers Plowman* was opened by Prof. Manly in a short but most important article (*Modern Philology*, Jan. 1906). Prof. Manly stated his conviction 'that the three versions were not the work of one and the same man, but each the work of a separate and distinct author.' Whilst reserving the full proof of these and of his other theses, he drew attention to certain incoherencies in the A-text. These, he argued, were due, not to carelessness on the part of the author, but to the loss of two leaves from the original MS., now lost, from which all extant MSS. of the A-text are derived. It followed that the B-reviser, who accepted this incoherent arrangement, and even added some lines with the object of making it more intelligible, could hardly be identical with the poet of the original A-version.

Three months later, Dr Henry Bradley in a letter to the *Athenæum*[1] accepted the view that these incoherencies of the A-text were due, not to the poet himself, but to a transcriber. He suggested however that the source of the derangement was to be sought 'not in a MS. written on parchment arranged in quires or gatherings, but in the "copy" (to use the word in the modern printer's sense) handed by the author to the first transcriber. This would no doubt be written on loose leaves of paper.' This modification allowed of a conjectural arrangement of the original text different from that of Prof. Manly, but of course left untouched his argument drawn from 'B's acceptation of the present defective text.'

Some two years later, in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Prof. Manly stated more at length, though still all too briefly, his views as to the independent authorship of the A- B- and C-texts. This article was subsequently issued as a separate pamphlet to members of the Early

[1] April 21, 1906.

English Text Society. The case against unity of authorship has thus been widely circulated in England: and there has been a tendency to accept views put forward with so much conviction and with the support of such high authorities. Prof. Manly's arguments have since been examined by M. Jusserand in *Modern Philology*, and Prof. Manly has replied to these criticisms. It is to be wished that M. Jusserand's defence of William Langland could be reprinted and circulated in England, since, for one English student who has access to the American periodical in which it is to be found, twenty read, in the *Cambridge History*, the case against the traditional view.

M. Jusserand however labours under the difficulty that he accepts the theory of the lost or misplaced leaf, whilst denying the consequence drawn from it by Prof. Manly. He is thus in a disadvantageous position. For, if we once accept the view that passages have been misplaced or lost, Prof. Manly's deductions seem to follow naturally. It is not merely that B accepted what, in that case, we must admit to be a defective text of A. This he might conceivably have done had he been A. But B also attempted to remedy the defect. Hence the parallel instances which have been quoted, of authors who, in revising their work, have failed to notice blemishes, are hardly to the point. B *did* notice an incoherency, and he remedied it, but in a way which shows that no suspicion that a leaf had been lost or shifted ever crossed his mind.

The defects found in the present A-text, and accepted by the B-reviser, are three.

(1) The confession of Robert the Robber comes at the end of the seven deadly sins, following Sloth, although, according to the mediæval classification, Robbery is a branch of Covetousness. (Dr Bradley.)

(2) The concluding lines of the confession of Sloth are, it is claimed, more appropriate to Covetousness, and should really be placed under that sin. (Dr Bradley's modification of Prof. Manly's view.)

(3) Certain lines mentioning Piers' wife and children seem incoherent, and have, it is claimed, been misplaced. (Prof. Manly.)

That there is something crude in these passages as they stand in both the A- and the B-text may be admitted. But that this incoherency is so gross that it must be due, not to A himself, but to a scrivener, is a statement which needs some examination.

I. Robert the Robber.

In any systematic treatise on the Sins, the proper place for an act of theft is indisputably under Covetousness, from which it springs. But does it therefore follow that the placing of Robert the Robber under Sloth, as found in all MSS. of the A-text, is so impossible that it cannot have been the intention of the original writer?

Robert's name shows that he represents a class, the 'Robert's Men,' professional vagabonds and thieves. This was pointed out by Skeat in his notes[1], but its importance, as bearing upon the *shifted leaf* controversy has, so far as I know, been overlooked.

Besides this passage in the Confession of Sloth, there are three important references in the A-text to these 'Robert's Men' or 'Wastours'—for that the two names are synonymous is clear from a Statute of Edward III, in which they are mentioned together[2].

In A Pro. 43 it is said of 'bidders and beggars[3]'

> In glotonye, god wot, go þei to bedde,
> And risen vp wiþ ribaudrie, as[4] Robertis knaues;
> Slep *and* sleuþe sewiþ hem eu*er*e.

Here, then, at the outset of the poem, we have Ribaldry, Gluttony and Sloth (not Covetousness) mentioned as the besetting sins of 'Robert's Men.'

In A vii, 140—172 we have a full length portrait of Wastour:

> Þanne gan Wast*our*[5] arise *and* wolde haue yfou3te,
> To Peris þe Plou3man he p*r*ofride his gloue....
> Wilt þ*ou*, nilt þou, we wile haue oure wil of þi[6] flo*ur*,

[1] Clarendon Press Edit. 1886, ii, 7.

[2] Item come en lestatut fait a Wyncestr*e*, en temps meisme le Roi lael, soit contenuz, q*ue* si nul estraunge passe p*ar* pais de nuyt, de qi h*o*mme eit suspecion, soit meintenant arestu & liv*er*e au visconte, & demoerge en gard tant qil soit duement deliv*er*es; et div*er*ses rob*er*ies, homicides, & felonies, ont este faitz einz ces heures p*ar* gentz qi sont appellez Roberdesmen, Wastours & Draghlacche; si est accorde et establi q*ue* si homme eit suspecion de mal de nuls tielx, soit il de jour, soit il de nuyt, q*ue* meintenant soient arestuz p*ar* les conestables des villes; et sils soient arestuz en fraunchises, soient liv*er*es as baillifs des fraunchises (Statutes of the Realm, 1810, i, 268, 5° Edwardi III, Cap. XIV).

[3] The quotations are given from T, the MS. in Trinity College, Cambridge (R. 3. 14), which on the whole seems to be the best A-text extant. The most obvious blunders of this MS. are corrected from a collation of the twelve other A-MSS. Such corrections are marked, and further details given in the footnotes. Variants in other cases are not recorded, nor is the usage of the MS. followed with regard to capitals and small letters. The MSS. collated are R (Rawlinson 137), U (Univ. Coll., Oxford), E (Trin. Coll., Dub.), I (Ingilby), H_2 (Harl. 6041), D (Douce 323), Dg (Digby 145), W (Westminster), L (Lincoln's Inn), As (Ashmole 1468), V (Vernon), H (Harl. 875).

For many collations of and references to MSS., used throughout this article, I am indebted to Mr J. H. G. Grattan.

[4] tho, þese, *etc.* H_2LVH.

[5] þe wast*our* T; þe wastor*es* R; a wast*our* I; H_2 *is wanting here. The other MSS. omit the article.*

[6] þi, þy RUEIAsVHDgWL; þis TH_2D.

And þi flessh fecche awey whanne vs likeþ,
And make vs mer*y*e *þer* wiþ maugre þi chekis.
Þanne Peris þe Plouȝman pleynede hym to þe kniȝt,
To kepen hym as couen*a*unt was fro curside shrewis,
Fro wastou*r*s þat waite wynne*r*es to shende.
Curteisliche þe kniȝt þanne, as his kynde wolde,
Warnide[1] Wastou*r* *and* wisside hym bete*r*e:
'Or þou shalt abigge be þe lawe be þe ordre þ*at* I bere.'
'I was not wonid to werche,' q*uaþ* Wastou*r*, 'now wile I not begynne.'
And let liȝt of þe lawe, *and* lesse of þe kniȝt,
And countide Peris at a pese *and* his plouȝ boþe,
And manacide hym *and* his men, whanne þey[2] next metten.

Now when Wastour proposed to raid Piers Plowman's barn he was giving way, a theologian would have said, to the sin of coveting other men's goods. Yet, taking the picture as a whole, Wastour would not be inappropriately placed under Sloth, and indeed it is as an example of idleness that the poet introduces him.

In VII, 66 Robyn or Robert 'the ribaudour' is mentioned with other typical scamps.

To our author[3] then, a *Robert's man* or a *Wastour* would seem to convey the notion of vagabondage, leading to ribaldry, gluttony and theft.

Would the confession of a Robert—for it must be noted that in this passage Robert is used almost as a common-noun[4]—who has not even been an industrious robber, seeing he has amassed nothing, be an unfit sequel to the Confession of Sloth?

And, turning to Robert's own confession, does it bear marks of having been written to illustrate Robert as having given way to the sin of Covetousness, or of Sloth?

It would have been easy to make a confession for Robbery which would show how Robbery springs from Covetousness. 'The author of the B-text' has done so when he makes his Avarice confess to having risen by night and robbed his companions' baggage. But Robert's confession shows nothing of this. It is not quite the case, as Dr Bradley says, that he 'bewails his crimes, and vows from henceforth to lead an honest life[5].' He says nothing about his crimes, beyond an admission that he has done ill: nor does he promise to lead an honest life. On

[1] þe *inserted after* warnide *in* TDgW; H_2 *wanting here.*
[2] þey] he T, *all other MSS.* þey, þai *&c.*; H_2 *wanting here.*
[3] I have intentionally omitted B's reference to Robert Renne-aboute (B. VI 150) who is mentioned as a typical idler, much as Robert the Ribaudour is in the earlier passage in A.
[4] We should read 'So rewe on this Robert' not 'So rewe on me, Robert' which is a corruption of the VH family of MSS. (found also in Dg.).
[5] *Athenæum*, April 21, 1906.

the contrary, he points out the difficulties which will beset him should he attempt to do so, and pleads guilty to thriftlessness and ignorance of any craft. He has nothing with which to make restitution; he

> on reddite lokide,
> Ac for þere was nouȝt where-with he wepte swiþe sore.

He is at his wits' end, for he knows no trade which will enable him to earn an honest living:

> So rewe on þis Robert, þat red non ne hauiþ,
> Ne neuere weniþ to wynne wiþ craft þat he knowiþ.
> (A, v, 251–2.)

Dr Bradley explains this 'as he knows no trade he cannot hope ever to earn the means of restoring what he has stolen[1].' But Robert's plight is even worse than this. He has no rede, and never weens, by any trade that he knows, to win, i.e., to work for his living[2]. And this is a confession more likely to have been written for a 'Robert' if he were intended to come under Sloth, than if he were intended to come under Avarice.

We may imagine our Robert as an idle apprentice, who from idleness has fallen into Wanhope; he has become an avowed outcast from society, a *felon*, as A calls him. Robert consoles himself by calling to memory the case of the penitent thief. Now Skeat pointed out long ago that the right place for the penitent thief is under Sloth, under the sub-heading Wanhope, which always belongs to Accidie.

We have, then, in the received A-text:

(1) l. 222. Introduction of Sleuthe.

(2) l. 225. 'War the for Wanhope.'

(3) ll. 242—259 the case of Robert the Robber, a *felon*, who, though he has no reed, and never hopes to earn an honest livelihood, yet

(4) ll. 246—248 comforts himself by the example of the Penitent Thief.

Exactly so, in Chaucer's Parson's Tale:

(1) Under the main heading Accidie, we have

(2) Wanhope.

(3) 'This horrible sinne is so perilous, that he that is despeired ther nis no *felonye* ne no sinne that he douteth for to do; as shewed wel by Iudas.'

(4) Yet the example of the Penitent Thief is given, to show that men should never despair.

[1] *The Nation* (New York), April 29, 1909, p. 437.

[2] For *win* see note on p. 6.

If the Parson's Tale places the thief and traitor Judas under Sloth-Wanhope rather than under Covetousness, there is surely no reason why Robert the Robber should not go under that head also. And the fact that elsewhere the poet associates Robert's men with Sloth, not with Covetousness, and that he makes Robert confess to being unemployable, rather than grasping, is strong indication that he intended him to go where all the MSS. put him.

True, Robert's lapses into highway robbery, or house-breaking, must have called for great, if intermittent, exertions. But this does not deprive him of his claim to a place under Sloth or Accidie, which is a neglect of God's grace and of honest industry. *Sinful* exertion rather qualifies than disqualifies. Wyclif[1] emphasises this: if a man is not doing good, he will be doing evil, 'for sumwhat mot a man do.' So in the *Ancren Riwle*[2] it is made clear that Sloth does not exclude evil works, but that, on the contrary, the idle are the more prompt to do the Devil's bidding.

There would seem then to be no ground for disturbing the order of the MSS., in so far as Robert the Robber is concerned.

II. Sloth's Wicked Winnings.

A more serious difficulty remains, if we are to defend the order of the MSS. of A. Sloth, in his vow, after promising for the future to be regular in his religious exercises, continues:

> And ȝet wile I ȝelde aȝen, ȝif I so muchel haue,
> Al þat I wykkidly wan siþen I wyt hadde.
> And[3] þeiȝ my liflode lakke, leten I nille
> *Þat* iche[4] man shal haue his er I hennis wende;
> And wiþ þe residue *and* þe remen*aunt*, be *þe* roode of Chestre,
> I wile seke Treuþe er I se[5] Rome.

'Wicked winnings' seem inappropriate to Sloth. But does 'win' in the language of *Piers Plowman* necessarily convey any idea of great gain? It may mean simply working for one's daily bread[6], indeed, *to labour* is the primary meaning of 'win' (cf. O.E. *winnan* to work, toil).

[1] Ed. Arnold III, 142.
[2] Ed. Morton, 212, 213.
[3] And *om.* TH_2DAs.
[4] iche a man T.
[5] seke TH_2: W *corrupt: other MSS.* se, see.
[6] E.g., A I, 153

For þauȝ ȝe be trewe of ȝo*ure* tunge *and* treweliche wynne,
And ek as chast as a child *þat* in chirche wepiþ. [T$\bar{R}H_2$D *have* For þi be (beþ).]
B VI, 322 Ac I warne ȝow, werkemen, wynneth while ȝe mowe.

In C I 222 hand labourers are called 'wynners with handen As taylours and tanners.' Prof. Skeat, to whom I am indebted for a most interesting letter on the subject says 'surely, to win is to *earn* simply: and *winner* is *worker*. If not, there's no point in the title of the poem *Winner and Waster*.'

Now Accidie being the neglect of honest industry, it follows that the slothful, above every man, wins wickedly. He and the covetous man are the only 'wicked winners' among the followers of the seven sins; but the slothful the most of the two. For the covetous man[1] may earn an honest living; his wicked winnings are the excess of his gains over what is justly his due. But a man, in so far as he is idle, cannot 'truly win' at all. He must live either by begging, or by receiving wages for services never rendered, like the 'dikers and delvers that do their deeds ill,' or by negligently withholding what is due to others. In each case he 'wins wickedly.'

The opening of Sloth's confession, with its promise of regular attendance at religious services, is strictly according to precedent: for the remedy against Sloth begins nearly always with a regular attendance at shrift and mass. But something further is, almost invariably, enjoined in all treatises: variously called *dedbote*[2], *satisfaction*[2], *besinesse, magnanimity, magnificence.* Could there be a better form of *satisfaction* or *besinesse* than for Sloth to make amends to all whom he has wronged through his slackness? This, at least, is how B understood the passage, and he has made the sense clearer by inserting lines above (B v, 429—435) showing how Sloth had failed to pay for that which he had borrowed.

Now it is argued that this is so far-fetched and muddle-headed an explanation that it is incredible that B, who certainly understood the passage so, can be identical with A, whose treatment shows 'firmness and mastery of structure.' I submit that it is by no means an impossible interpretation.

Perhaps technically it is wrong to place the withholding of wages and of things borrowed under Sloth rather than Avarice. But the distinction is one which it is difficult to draw, and where it is exceedingly easy to go wrong. In the *Ancren Riwle*[3], whilst the withholding of wages is equated with robbery and placed under Avarice, carelessness with regard to pledges is put under Sloth. Surely the intention must count. Deliberate appropriation of others' goods would proceed from Covetousness: unintentional misappropriation from Sloth.

[1] Unless he spend his time in practising *usury*, in which case he is as much a burden to the commonweal as the slothful man. For usury is 'unkind,' unnatural and unproductive. Cf *Piers Plowman* B v, 276, Dante, *Inf.* xi, 94—111.

[2] These, of course, need mean no more than penance or perhaps even penitence.

[3] þe þet ne warneð oðer of his vuel oðer of his lure nis hit slouh ȝemeleste oðer attri onde? Misiteoðeget, etholden cwide, oðer fundles, oðer lone, nis hit ȝiscunge oðer þeofte? Etholden oðres hure ouer his rihte terme nis hit strong reflac? þet is under ȝiscunge. Oðer ȝif me ȝemeð wurse ei þing ileaned oðer biteih to witene þen he wene þet hit ouh, nis hit tricherie oðer ȝemeleaste of slouhðe? Ed. Morton, 1853, p. 208.

But, after all, the author of the A-text must be judged by his own usage, not by that of the *Ancren Riwle*. Can we find any passage in which A associates any definite act with 'wicked winning' or its antithesis 'true winning'?

Piers Plowman in making his will (A VII, 89—94) says:

> My wyf shal haue of *þat* I wan wiþ treuþe *and* namore,
> And dele among my frendis *and* my dere children.
> For þei3 I dei3e to day my dettis ben quyt,
> I bar hom þat I borewide er I to bedde 3ede.
> And wiþ þe residue *and* þe remen*aun*t, be þe rode of Chestre,
> I wile worsshipe *þer*e wiþ Treuþe in my lyue.

Here is a passage which, from the way in which it re-echoes the same phrases, seems to have been written with deliberate reference to the 'Sloth' passage under consideration, and in it our author associates prompt repayment with 'true winning.' Yet it is asserted to be incredible that by 'wicked winning' he can have meant slackness in repayment of debt.

It may be objected that, though this would be an adequate explanation if we were dealing with the text of the B-reviser, who often misses out a stage in his argument, and is guilty of incoherency and want of discrimination, such incoherency would have been quite impossible with 'so careful an artist as A, who in no single instance assigns to any character either words or actions not clearly and strictly appropriate.'

But, on the showing of his treatment of the other Deadly Sins, was A the 'careful artist' which the advocates of multiple authorship make him? Here is the complete confession of one of the Sins:

> ...seide allas, *and* on[1] oure lady criede
> To make mercy for his mysdede betwyn god *and* hym;
> Wiþ *þat* he shulde[2] þe satirday seue 3er *þer* aftir
> Drinke but wiþ þe doke *and* dyne but ones.

Ask any person, unfamiliar with the text, what sin this represents, and he will assuredly say 'Gluttony.' But our 'careful artist, who in no single instance assigns to any character either words or actions not clearly and strictly appropriate,' meant it to represent Lust. It is easy to gloss the text by explaining that the eating of two or more dinners *per diem*, which Lecchour abjures, tends towards Lust (though I should rather have thought it tended towards indigestion) whilst abstinence leads to continence. But I understand the claim for A to be that he is so coherent that he needs no gloss, and therefore cannot be B, who

[1] on RUEDDgWLI, to TH_2V, H *corrupt.*
[2] shulde *misplaced in* TH_2.

often does. Once admit A capable of incoherency, and there is no longer any necessity to assume that the incoherency of his Sloth must of necessity be due to a shifted or missing leaf.

And A's other 'Sins' are almost equally incoherent. A's Pride shows signs of Envy, and perhaps of other sins. A's Envy shows as many traits of Wrath as of Envy. No one reading A's Gluttony could tell whether it was the confession of Gluttony or of Accidie. It begins with neglect of shrift and ends with sleeping all Sunday. And note that, whilst it is Gluttony who is kept away from Church by lingering over his ale, it is Sloth who vows never to do so again. Here also it may be urged that the Glutton and the Slothful man are hardly distinguishable, and that therefore it does not much matter if what strictly belongs to the one is mentioned under the heading of the other: but equally, I think, were the robber and the sturdy beggar indistinguishable on the ill-policed roads of the fourteenth century. If A is capable of confusing the one pair, he might well have confused the other.

But indeed the incoherencies of A have been so ably pointed out by M. Jusserand that it is waste of time to urge the matter further. It need only be added here that the scribes themselves were puzzled by A's want of clearness. One scribe, most excusably, glosses *Envy* as *Wrath*: another, feeling the inadequacy of the confession of Lust, adds the following lines, so as to make the sin agree with the name:

> And chastite to seke as a chyld clene,
> The lust of his likam to leten for eu*ere*,
> And fle fro felyschipe ther*e* foly may arise,
> For that makith many man mysdo ful ofte.

These lines cannot possibly be genuine: they are found only in one inferior MS., of one class: but their addition serves to show that there were readers in the fifteenth century who felt the inadequacy of A's description of the Sins.

Can it then be regarded as proved that (1) A's Sloth is anything worse than incoherent or that (2) A was incapable of incoherency?

III. Piers' Wife and Children.

The last instance where the B reviser is stated to have passed over a palpable dislocation of A's text is in the speech of Piers in Passus VII.

> And who so helpiþ me to eren or any þing swynke
> Shal haue, be oure lord, þ*e* more here in heruist,
> And make hym m*er*y wiþ þe corn, who so it begrucchiþ.

And alle kyne crafty men *þat* conne lyue in treuþe
I shal fynde hem foode *þat* feiþfulliche libbeþ;
Saue Iakke þe Iugelo*ur*, *and* Ionete of þe stewis,
And Robyn þe ribaudo*ur* for hise rusty woordis.
Treuþe tolde me ones *and* bad me telle it forþ
Deleantur de libro I shulde[1] not dele wiþ hem;
For holy chirche is holden of hem no tiþes to asken
Et cum iustis non scribantur.
Þei be[2] askapid good auntir, now god hem amende.
Dame Werche whanne tyme is Piers wyf hatte,
His dou3te*r* hattiþ Do ri3t so[3] or þi da*m*me shal þe bete,
His sone hattiþ Suffre þi sou*er*eynes to hauen he*re* wille
And deme hem nou3t for 3if þ*ou* dost þ*ou* shalt it dere abiggen.
Let god worþe wiþ al for so his woord techiþ.
For now[4] I am old *and* hor *and* haue of myn owene
To pen*a*unce *and* to pilg*r*image wile I passe w*i*th o*þe*re.
For þi I wile er I wende do wryte[5] my bequest.

Accordingly the Testament follows, with mention (VII, 89, 90) of Piers' wife and children.

Professor Manly regards the five lines beginning 'Dame Werche whanne tyme is' as having been placed by an error in their present position: and the view that the text has been deranged has been accepted by Dr Furnivall and M. Jusserand. Professor Manly argues 'The names of the wife and children of Piers, originally written in the margin opposite ll. 89—90 by some scribe, have been absurdly introduced into the text, to the interruption and confusion of the remarks of Piers in regard to his preparations for his journey.'

But these names do *not* interrupt Piers' remarks about preparations for his journey. Piers' last allusion to his journey was in l. 59, twelve lines before the mention of his wife and children. The lines immediately preceding the names are an admonition to work. And this admonition is then emphasised and summarised in the names of Piers' family 'Dame-Work-when-time-is' and 'Do-right-so-or-thy-dame-shall-thee-beat.' There is nothing wrong with the text here; for this introduction of remarks about persons and things, which seem quite irrelevant, until we scrutinize their *names*, is a favourite trick of our author's. We may regard it as an ungainly trick; but that is not the point, for we can easily parallel it in the A-text. In Passus IV Reason has been admonishing the King that no wrong should go unpunished:

For *nullum malum* the mon mette[6] *with Inpunitum*
And bad *nullum bonum* be[7] *irremuneratum.* (IV, 126–7.)

[1] ne shulde T. H_2As *wanting for all this passage*, E *for part.*
[2] arn T, *other MSS.* be, ben, beþ.
[3] so *omitted* TDE, *found in all other MSS.*
[4] now *omitted* TD, *found in all other MSS.*
[5] wyte T: W *corrupt: other MSS.* write.
[6] the mon mette] he may mete TH_2D. [7] *bonum* be] malum T.

What have *Nullum Malum*, his meeting with *Inpunitum* and his remarks to *Nullum Bonum* to do with Reason's sermon? Nothing: but putting together the names of these characters we have a sentence which has every bearing upon Reason's foregoing words. Similarly, *Piers' wife* has nothing to do with his preceding remarks: but the *name of Piers' wife* has everything.

IV. The Rearranged Text compared with the Text given in the MSS.

Hitherto I have tried to show that, in the passages where the text is supposed to have been proved to be deranged, the order given in the MSS. is not impossible: and that therefore the evidence for the shifted leaf is not of that overwhelmingly strong character which is necessary, if it is to carry the weight of the argument which has been built upon it.

It should be enough if the MS. order has been shown to be possible: it is unreasonable to call upon an author, under pain of being divided into five, to prove that his arrangement of his matter cannot be improved. Yet I think that it can further be shown that the MS. order actually offers fewer objections than do the proposed rearrangements.

First with regard to the lines as to Piers' wife and children. Piers' family, in virtue of their names, are linked to the admonitions preceding: and the mention of wife and family brings us naturally to the Testament. These lines then conclude the admonition and introduce the will, linking the one to the other, albeit clumsily. Remove them, and we have a crude transition. And where are we to place them? Professor Manly would dismiss them as an expansion of a marginal gloss —a device which has served the turn of innumerable critics. But the names cannot have been the marginal glosses of a scribe, *for they alliterate.* It is certain that whoever invented the names of wife *Work*, daughter *Do*, and son *Suffer* meant them to take their place in an alliterative text. Therefore the lines, if removed at all, must be placed elsewhere. But to insert them after ll. 89, 90, in the will, *is* to cause an interruption. A man does not name himself in the third person in his will.

It is not denied that the passage, as it stands, is clumsy, though not more so than many other passages in A. The point is that the removal

of the five lines does not make the passage less clumsy; whilst their insertion into the will is not so much clumsy as impossible.

And in a somewhat similar way, but on a much larger scale, the rearrangement of A's text proposed by Dr Bradley, whilst smoothing away an incoherency of the kind to which A is peculiarly prone, interferes with and disturbs the actual succession of his thought, as it develops itself in the vision of the Seven Deadly Sins, of the Pilgrimage to St Truth, and of Piers the Guide.

The poet's object in these visions is not to give a theologically accurate picture of the Seven Sins, carefully discriminating and differentiating. So long as we look for this we shall naturally fail fully to appreciate him, just as those who look in the Utopia for its author's picture of a perfect state fail to appreciate Sir Thomas More. More did not wish to draw a complete political chart of a perfect republic, nor did the A-poet wish to draw a complete theological chart of the seven deadly sins. The object of both is the same: in the language of Erasmus concerning More 'to show the dangers which threatened the Commonwealth of England[1].' The evils from which the Commonwealth was suffering in the opinion of our poet were especially the rapacity of its upper classes and the laziness of its lower classes. So much we can gather from the prologue, where most of the people censured could be placed in the one class or the other. 'Do the duty of your calling, whatever it may be, and flee from covetousness' is again the gist of Passus I. Passus II—IV are then devoted more particularly to the corruption of the official classes. In Passus V—VII we return to idleness, more particularly that of the poor. Here appears Piers Plowman, who has had no part to play in the earlier vision. For Piers, as is shown by his very name, and that of his wife, is the antithesis of idleness. Piers is here by no means an ideal saint. He jangles with the ribald priest, 'in pure tene,' he even rends the precious charter sent by Truth Himself. Piers knows the way to Truth, not because he is impeccable, but because he has worked honestly[2].

> Clene consience *and* wyt kende me to his place,
> And dede me to sure hym to *ser*ue hym for eu*er*e;

[1] Letter to Ulrich von Hutten, ccccxlvii.

[2] This is well brought out in Gascoigne's *Steel Glass*, where all the faults of the ploughman are described in full:

> I see you Peeree, my glasse was lately scowrde.
> But for they feed with frutes of their gret paines
> Both king and knight and priests in cloyster pent,
> Therefore I say that sooner some of them
> Shall scale the walles which leade us up to heaven, etc.

Boþe to sowen and to setten[1] while I swynke miȝte.
I haue ben his folewere al þis fourty wynter,
Boþe sowen his seed *and* sewide hise bestis,
And kepide his corn *and* cariede it to house,
Dyken *and* deluen *and* do what he hiȝte,
Wiþinne *and* wiþoute. waytide his profit. (A VI, 30.)

For the way to Truth, on which Piers can guide the pilgrims, is the way of honest labour. Piers' guidance of the pilgrims actually consists in setting them all to work, and with Hunger's help in reducing even Waster to submission (Passus VII). Then Truth gives his pardon to all who have laboured in their vocation (Passus VIII).

Hence it is not so strange that the A poet should have given no description of Lust; it is quite possible that he never even pretended to give a description of Wrath. This would indeed be 'a degree either of thoughtlessness or of stupidity not easily conceivable[2]' if our poet's end had been to describe the Seven Sins. But it is only his means towards an end; the end is a statement of the economic and social problems of his day. On these Lust or Wrath[3] have little bearing. Avarice is more to the point, for it affords a picture of the regrater: Gluttony gives an opening to describe workmen 'doing their deeds ill' and driving forth the long day in the tavern. Finally comes Sloth, and it is appropriate that Sloth should be the sinner who vows to seek Truth; for the seeking of Truth, we have seen, is the way of work. Robert, too, will polish his pike and go on his pilgrimage, and a thousand of men throng together and cry for grace to seek Truth. The palmer, a representative of the class of 'lubbers loth to work,' cannot tell the way to Truth.

Then after these four idlers, of different types, Gluttony, Sloth, Robert and the Palmer, Piers is introduced. He has laboured, and so he knows the way without needing any man to guide him. In doing his ordinary work 'setting and sowing' these forty winters, he has all the time been serving Truth.

Piers is the antithesis of the loafers who precede him: and when he says:

To pen*a*unce *and* to pilg*ri*mage wile I passe w*ith* o*þer*e.
For þi I wile, er I wende, do wryte my bequest,

[1] (to) sowen and (to) setten, *from* V: *also in* EIDgWDLAsH. TH_2 *have* sowe his seed: RU nowe and siþe.

[2] Bradley in the *Athenæum*, April 21, 1906.

[3] B, of course, adds a Confession of Wrath. In accordance with the practice of both A and B, this is no mere account of an individual wrathful man. It is a protest against the hatred shown by members of the religious orders towards one another: and more particularly against that great scandal of the fourteenth century, the feud of the friar with other orders of the clergy.

we might expect that his Testament would be a contrast to the confessions of those who have slacked, whilst he has worked. And in fact we do find an exact parallelism between the confession of Sloth, and the Testament of Piers. Sloth has failed in his service to God, and vows amendment: Piers has paid his church dues and can claim his reward. Sloth has 'won wickedly': Piers has 'won truly.' Sloth will make good 'though his livelihood lacks' 'ere he wends hence': but as for Piers 'though he die to-night' *his* debts are quit, he paid 'ere he went to bed.'

> And wiþ þe residue *and* þe remen*a*unt, be þe roode of Chestre,
> I wile seke Treuþe er I se Rome[1]!

says Sloth: and Piers echoes the words

> And wiþ þe residue *and* þe remen*a*unt, be þe rode of Chestre,
> I wile worsshipe *þer*e wiþ Treuþe in my lyue.

Dr Bradley's rearrangement, on the other hand, separates the vow to seek Truth by nearly one hundred lines from the thronging crowds who cry for grace to seek him: it adds to the Confession of Avarice lines which, as has been urged by Professor Brown and Mr Knott[2], are not only unnecessary there, but actually inconsistent.

Finally, it must be remembered that evidence which might be sufficient to show a probability of interpolations, or of lost or shifted leaves, in a one MS. text, is insufficient in the case of a text preserved in thirteen MSS., which seem to have remarkably few *common* errors, and the archetype of which, if not actually the author's holograph, was probably not far removed therefrom. When Prof. Manly suggests that ll. 71–4 of Passus VII are a scribe's gloss, which has been absurdly introduced into the text in a wrong position, it must be remembered that such a corruption postulates time and a succession of copyists. This difficulty is avoided by Dr Bradley's theory as to the origin of the 'Sloth' confusion; that the mistake was made by the shifting of a page of the author's rough notes before they were transcribed by the scrivener into a formal book. But are we justified in assuming that the poem, when it received its author's final inspection, was still in the form of notes on odd sheets of paper or parchment? The *Commedia* made Dante lean for many years[3]: *Troilus* did not produce this effect on

[1] Dr Bradley has suggested that these lines may be spurious. But there seems nothing to support this supposition. Spurious lines do not appear to be very common in the A-text: they seem to be confined almost invariably to one MS. or class of MSS., and the reason for their insertion is generally obvious.

[2] *The Nation* (New York), March 25, 1909; May 13, 1909.

[3] *Par.* XXV, 3.

Chaucer, yet he spent many a day in correcting his scrivener's errors: Caxton, till age made him less industrious and more prone to mechanical devices, seems to have regarded it as naturally his business himself to transcribe his own works[1]. Yet Dante, Chaucer, and Caxton were all busy men of affairs. Are we justified in taking for granted that an obscure and probably poor writer, like the A-poet, employed the luxurious methods of modern journalism, left the publication of his poem entirely to the scrivener, and never then or in later years read it through again? For, had he done so, then *ex hypothesi* he would have noticed the mistake and had it put right. Though some erroneous transcripts might have got about, the corrected copies would also have been multiplied, and it is hardly likely that our very large collection of A-text MSS. would have failed to include some descendants of the corrected copies.

Of course it is *possible* that our author sent his work in loose sheets to the scrivener, and never looked at it again: it is stated that Dr Johnson sent *Rasselas* to the printer sheet by sheet, as it was finished, and never re-read it. But in *Rasselas* Dr Johnson, writing for money under extreme pressure, put into a certain form thoughts which he would probably have preferred to express through another medium. In *Piers Plowman* we have a book which can only have been written because its author loved to write it; a book which we should guess had 'made its author lean,' stamped to an extraordinary degree with his character and mode of thought. That that mode of thought was not perfectly orderly and coherent I have tried briefly to show. Is an explanation quite satisfactory, which, in order to excuse our poet of neglect of strict order and coherency in one passage, necessarily accuses him of neglect of his whole poem? Of the two possibilities is not this last neglect the more improbable?

It must be remembered that the question is not whether, on the whole, the text would make better sense if rearranged. Where MS. evidence is equally divided we can, of course, only choose the most plausible arrangement. But here there is no particle of MS. evidence in favour of a rearrangement of the received text. The proposed rearrangements are pure conjecture. Unless the advantage to be gained by the rearrangement is very great indeed a cautious editor would not, under these circumstances, accept it; still less found a theory upon it.

Only (1) if the MS. reading absolutely refuses to make sense, and

[1] *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye, sub fin.*

(2) if the proposed rearrangement of the text is so convincing that it has only to be stated to be at once recognized as right, do we get that certainty which is necessary, before we can build argument as to authorship upon conjectural emendation.

I have tried to prove that the first of these conditions is not the case: that the second is not the case is proved by the fact that those who are most convinced that some confusion has taken place are quite unable to agree wherein the error exactly consists. Three rearrangements are suggested: that of Prof. Manly, followed by Mr Knott; that of Dr Bradley, followed by Dr Furnivall and M. Jusserand; and that arrived at independently by Prof. Brown and Mr Hall. And each critic finds serious difficulties in the rearrangements suggested by the others.

Even Prof. Manly's supporters must, I think, allow that the element of certainty, which is necessary before we can use the 'shifted leaf' theory as a basis on which to build other theories, is wanting. We must therefore turn to the other arguments brought forward by Prof. Manly.

V. B's misunderstandings of A.

Many instances are alleged by Prof. Manly, in the *Cambridge History*, in which B has misunderstood A, and C has misunderstood B. These cases have been examined by M. Jusserand in Sections v and vii of his reply. Jusserand *here* does not accept Manly's data whilst denying his conclusions, but denies data, conclusions and all. For the most part, therefore, it is enough to refer the reader to M. Jusserand's very sufficient comments. In view of Prof. Manly's reply, one or two supplementary points not raised by M. Jusserand may perhaps be added.

(1) 'B has misunderstood A, or spoiled his picture,' Prof. Manly asserts, in B II, 21, where 'Lewte is introduced as the leman of the lady Holy Church and spoken of as feminine.' M. Jusserand has shown that there is no incompatibility between Lewte being feminine and also being called a lemman. But this hardly needed proof. Prof. Manly's point, as he explains in his reply[1], is 'that here the *leman* of a lady is spoken of [by B] as feminine' and that this involves 'a spoiling of the conception of A, and a misunderstanding or forgetfulness of it.'

In A Holy Church is certainly represented as a lady: but that B even momentarily forgot or misunderstood this there is nothing to show.

[1] *Modern Philology*, VII, 116 (1909).

For elsewhere B uses *leman* in a context which shows that he does not wish to emphasize any difference of sex. In XIV 298–9 he interprets 'paupertas sanitatis mater' as

> moder of helthe, a frende in alle fondynges,
> And for þe land euere a leche, a lemman of al clennesse.

And that in the 'Holy Church' passage *leman* is used in a similar broad and general sense, simply as 'beloved,' is proved by the context. B cannot have intended to make Lewte the 'betrothed' or 'sweetheart' of Holy Church, *for only ten lines lower he has allotted that part to Mercy and the merciful.* God, says the lady Holy Church,

> hath 3oue me mercy · to marye with my-self;
> And what man be merciful · and lelly me loue,
> Schal be my lorde and I his leef · in þe hei3e heuene.

It seems hardly possible for Prof. Manly to contend that B, who added these lines, meant Holy Church to be masculine. If he did, then the self-contradiction in B is as great as the contradiction between A and B: and whatever force the argument has to prove that A is not B is equally valid to prove that B is not B.

(2) In B the rat describes '*segges* in the City of London' who wear collars: these *segges* C explains as *gret syres.* Therefore C cannot, Prof. Manly urges, have been B, who by *segges* meant dogs. But if so, what is the point of the mention of the *City of London*? One need not go up to London to see a dog wearing a collar[1]. Surely the reference is to the official dress of great city magistrates,—mayors and masters, knights and squires: and the humour lies in the rat's taking these officials for what they are, dangerous beasts, who prey upon the commonwealth. Only by this interpretation can we get any sense out of *in the City of London,* or any humour out of the whole passage.

It is unfortunate that in the *Cambridge History* space did not allow of Prof. Manly developing his argument fully: for in many cases it is not clear wherein the supposed misunderstanding of A by B or B by C lies. And in no case has Prof. Manly attempted more than dogmatic assertion. What the assertion is worth can only be estimated by comparing minutely the texts of A and B. There is not space to so examine all the alleged misunderstandings. The following instance selected for examination is certainly not unfair to Prof. Manly; it is a point on which he has throughout laid special stress.

[1] Representations of dogs wearing collars are exceedingly common on sepulchral monuments of the late 14th century all over England.

'In II, 74 ff. B does not understand that the feoffment covers precisely the provinces of the seven deadly sins; and, by elaborating the passage, spoils the unity of the intention[1].'

Here is the passage in A:

> To be *pr*esent in pride for pou*er*e or for[2] riche,
> Wiþ þe Erldom of enuye for eu*er*e to laste,
> Wiþ alle þe lordsshipe of leccherie in[3] lengþe *and* in brede,
> Wiþ þe kingdom of coueitise I croune hem to gid*er*e,
> And al þe Ile of vsurie *and* auarice þe faste[4];
> Glotonye *and* grete oþes I gyue hem to gid*er*e,
> Wiþ alle þe delites of lust þe deuil for to s*er*ue;
> In al þe s*eignour*ie of slouþe I sese[5] hem togid*er*e.

This is clearly meant to cover the seven sins, though it does not do so, as Manly asserts, 'precisely': for Wrath is missing. Avarice and Gluttony are expanded by coupling with them their respective allied sins, Usury and Great Oaths.

Prof. Manly supposes the omission of Wrath to be due to the error of an early copyist. But it is begging the question to first emend a text into precision, against the evidence of all the MSS., and then to base an argument upon the precision of the text so emended. And even the addition of Wrath does not make A's enumeration of the sins 'precise.' Prof. Manly has not noticed that his 'careful artist' has counted Lust twice over. This is concealed by a textual corruption in the Vernon MS., but a collation of all the MSS. shows it to be indisputably the case.

Turning to B, we find that he has elaborated the passage by the addition of many other allied vices: so far however from having failed to see that the charter covers the provinces of the seven sins (1) he has added *Wrath*, and (2) in adding details of cognate sins has been careful to put each under the appropriate head of the Deadly Sin from which it springs. B, in fact, shows more care to classify his sins properly here than A does when he is avowedly dealing with the Seven Sins in Passus V.

Let us take the text exactly as it stands in B:

> To be prynces in pryde · and pouerte to dispise.

Under Pride we rightly have, as one of its branches, *Despite*, which is mentioned as a branch of pride both in the *Parsons Tale*, and (under

[1] *Cambridge History*, II, 32: see also *Modern Philology* III (Jan. 1906): VII, 121 (July 1909).

[2] o*þer* TH_2 or for RUEIDgWDLVH.

[3] leccherie in V *omits*.

[4] faste TRUDg false DVH. *Corrupt or wanting* EIH_2WL.

[5] sese, ceese, *&c.* RUEIH_2DgWLVH. set TD. As *wanting throughout*.

the name of *onworþnesse*) in the *Ayenbite of Inwit*. The three branches of this *Despite*, according to the *Ayenbite*, are (1) *disesteeming* others, (2) *dishonouring* others, (3) *disobeying* others.

To bakbite and to bosten · and bere fals witnesse,
To scorne and to scolde · and sclaundere to make.

Backbiting, bearing false witness, and *making slander* are only forms of *disesteeming* others. *To scorn and to scold* is to *dishonour* and *insult* others ('þe vifte out-kestinge of þe ilke stocke is scorn' says the *Ayenbite*, under *Arrogance* the third bough of Pride). *Boasting* clearly comes under Pride: 'Avauntour...he that bosteth of the harm or of the bountee that he hath doon' comes second on the Parson's list of those guilty of Pride; *yelpingge* (boasting) is the fourth twig of the third bough of Pride in the *Ayenbite*.

Vnboxome and bolde · to breke þe ten hestes.

Inobedience is placed first among the branches of Pride in the *Parson's Tale*: to think 'hou ueleziþe þou hest y-by *onbozsam*' comes in the *Ayenbite* under the second section of Pride.

To break the ten hests. 'He that disobeyeth for despyt to the comandements of God' is placed first in the *Parson's Tale* on the list of the Proud. And rightly, for Pride is 'the general rote of alle harmes; for of þis rote springen certein braunches, as Ire, Envye, Accidie or Slewthe, Avarice or Coveitise, Glotonye, Lecherye.'

Every one of the sins added by B under Pride is then strictly appropriate to that sin.

And þe Erldome of enuye · and Wratthe togideres,
With þe chastelet of chest · and chateryng-oute-of-resoun.

Chiding and chattering rightly come under Wrathe: 'Vor huanne wreþe arist betuene tuay men: þer is uerst chidinge' (*Ayenbite*, p. 30). Both are specifically mentioned under Wrath in the *Parson's Tale*: 'Chydinge and reproche' (§ 42), 'ydel wordes, Ianglinge, Iaperie' (§ 47). If it is objected that we have already had these sins under Pride, that is to be ascribed, not to the much abused B-poet, but to Mediæval Theology: the same repetition comes in the *Parson's Tale*, where Jangling is enumerated under both heads[1] (§§ 24, 47).

The counte of coueitise · and alle þe costes aboute
That is vsure and auarice · alle I hem graunte
In bargaines and in brokages · with al þe borghe of theft.

[1] Professor Manly has himself pointed out that 'the Seven Sins were treated as tempers or tendencies out of which particular misdeeds grow. And, naturally, the same deed, the same sin, may originate in any one of several different tempers or tendencies.' Undoubtedly. Yet the whole case for the 'missing leaf' in Passus v and for the 'misunderstanding' here rests upon unwillingness to recognize this.

The two first subdivisions of 'auarice' or 'couaytyse' in the *Ayenbite* are *Usury* and *Theft*[1]. The eighth is *Chaffer*[2], which is only another way of expressing *Bargains and Brocages.*

> And al þe lordeship of lecherye · in lenthe and in brede
> As in werkes and in wordes · and waitynges with eies,
> And in wedes and in wisshynges · and with ydel thou3tes
> Ther as wille wolde · and werkmanship failleth.
> Glotonye he gaf hem eke · and grete othes togydere,
> And alday to drynke · at dyuerse tauernes,
> And there to iangle and to iape · and iugge here euene cristene,
> And in fastyng-dayes to frete · ar ful tyme were.
> And þanne to sitten and soupen—

The coupling of Great Oaths with Gluttony may seem strange; but A had done it in *his* enumeration. B can then hardly be charged *here* with spoiling A's picture. Yet, indeed, evil speaking of all kinds goes with gluttony *as being a sin of the mouth* (*Ayenbite*, p. 50). To jangle and jape and judge one's fellow Christians comes in then quite rightly here.

> —til slepe hem assaille
> And breden as burgh-swyn · and bedden hem esily.
> Tyl sleuth and slepe · slyken his sides
> And þanne wanhope to awake hym so....

It will hardly be denied that both Sleep and Wanhope come under Sloth. Both are mentioned under this head in the *Ayenbite* (pp. 31, 34) and the *Parson's Tale* (§ 56).

B then, in elaborating the passage, has arranged the faults under the heading of the respective deadly sin; and he has completed A's imperfect enumeration by adding *Wrath.* How can it be stated that 'B does not understand that the feoffment covers precisely the provinces of the seven deadly sins,' and that we have instead 'an unsystematic general collection of all the sins the author could think of'? The sins overlap, but not more so than in Chaucer's or Dan Michel's, or, what is more to the point, in B's own account of the Seven Sins. When Prof. Manly supposes[3] that in adding, among other sins, *Unbuxomhood, Boasting, Scorning,* and *Bearing of False Witness,* B cannot have understood that he was dealing with Pride, he must surely have overlooked the fact that these very sins are mentioned by B in Passus XIII 276—313 as subdivisions of Pride[4].

[1] þe uerste is gauelinge. þe oþer þyefþe (p. 34).
[2] þe e3tende bo3 of auarice is chapfare (p. 44).
[3] *Modern Philology*, VII, 121.
[4] As to Dan Michel's classification see note at end.

VI. Differences of Dialect between A, B and C.

Prof. Manly concludes his case, 'a careful study of the MSS. will show that between A, B and C there exist dialectal differences incompatible with the supposition of a single author. This can be easily tested in the case of the pronouns and the verb *are*[1].'

But this is as if one should go into an asylum for the blind, and tell one's hearers that they can easily see a thing for themselves.

For, of the 47 MSS. only four are in print: the Vernon MS. of the A-text, the Laud and Trinity MSS. of the B-text, the Phillipps MS. of the C-text. The twelve unprinted MSS. of the A-text differ widely in point of dialect from the printed text, and from one another—we have a Southern text, a Northern text, and many varieties of Midland, besides texts which it is difficult to classify. The B and C texts also vary in the different MSS. The four printed texts were selected for publication on grounds quite other than those of dialect: indeed, in one case, that of the Vernon A-text, it has always been recognized that the dialect is the scribe's, not the author's: 'the dialect in which the poem was first written has been modified by a Southern scribe, whence the numerous Southern forms[2].'

How then is the reader to test Prof. Manly's statement?

Fortunately Prof. Skeat has printed a passage of eleven lines from all the MSS., and as it happens, at any rate in the A and B MSS., these lines are most extraordinarily rich in those forms which Prof. Manly has suggested as tests[3].

[1] *Camb. Hist.*, vol. II, p. 34.
[2] Skeat in Cl. Press edit., vol. II, p. lxvi.
[3] In the C text the earlier portion of the passage was so changed as to be useless for the test proposed. A comparison shows:

l. 1.	*ben* (*beþ*, *be*, &c.)	found in thirteen A-MSS., *er* in one ,, ,, sixteen B-MSS., *are* in one C wanting
l. 5.	*are* (*arn*, *aren*, &c.)	,, ,, ten A-MSS., *ben* in four ,, ,, all seventeen B-MSS. C wanting
l. 7.	*thei* (*they*, &c.)	,, ,, all fourteen A-MSS. ,, ,, all thirteen B-MSS. C wanting
l. 8.	*hem* (*hym*, &c.)	,, ,, twelve A-MSS., *þaim* in one ,, ,, fifteen B-MSS., *them* in one ,, ,, all C-MSS.
l. 9.	*here* (*hire*, *heore*, &c.)	,, ,, thirteen A-MSS., *þair* in one ,, ,, sixteen B-MSS., *theyre* in one ,, ,, all C-MSS.
l. 10.	*thei* (*they*, *thay*, &c.)	,, ,, ten A-MSS., *he* in four ,, ,, all seventeen B-MSS. ,, ,, thirteen C-MSS., *hy* in one.

It would appear, *if we dare generalize from these eleven lines* (which, of course, it would be rash to do), that the A-poet used *are* and *be* indiscriminately, and preferred *they* in the nominative[1], *hem* and *here* in the oblique cases. In this he seems to have been followed by B and C. Nor is it only when they have A before them that B and C adhere to this rule. If we can take the Laud and Phillipps MSS. as fair texts of B and C respectively, we find that in the new matter which they add[2] both follow the same practice. So that, to judge by the only passage in which, at present, the ordinary student can test it, Prof. Manly's dialect formula breaks down utterly. As to the results of a more detailed examination, Mr Grattan, who during our collation of the different A-MSS. has devoted particular attention to points bearing on the question of dialect, informs me that he has, so far, found nothing to substantiate Prof. Manly's statement in the smallest degree.

So complicated, and often so contradictory, are the dialectal forms in the different A-MSS. that months, or years, of study would be necessary before any man could master them fully. An attempt to classify them could hardly fill less than three or four hundred pages, and the compiler of those pages would be lucky indeed if his results satisfied either himself or others. For first he must fix the dialect of the different MSS. which lie behind our extant copies. From these hypothetical texts he must construct the dialect of the MS. from which they all derive. Yet this archetype may be far removed, as Prof. Manly realizes, from the original author's autograph. By the same hypothetical processes the student must then formulate the dialect of his original B-text. He must then decide whether the difference between his theoretical A-dialect and his theoretical B-dialect is too great to allow of their being both the speech of one and the same man, allowing for an interval of fifteen years. Given two specified texts, it would often be impossible to decide this. It will be hard indeed to prove inconsistency when we have to work upon two theoretical texts, each thrice removed from any sure basis of evidence.

l. 7. Four B-MSS. are here defective and have no pronoun.

l. 8. The Lincoln's Inn MS., Ashburnham cxxx and Bodley 851 are corrupt or wanting here.

I have followed Skeat's enumeration of A B and C-MSS.

Many of the MSS. are compounded from two texts, and in strict accuracy should not be counted in comparative statistics of the different texts.

[1] Probably not to the exclusion of *hy*; *hy may* be the right reading in l. 10 of the extract, for the four MSS. supporting it (*he*) are all excellent ones. *Hy* seems to be necessitated by the alliteration in C XII, 216, and is found elsewhere in C.

[2] Both *are* and forms of *be* occur everywhere in B and C. The alliteration seems to show that in B XII, 195 (and perhaps also in B XIV, 222) *ben* was the original form.

This most difficult task Prof. Manly has undertaken. He has announced his conclusion, but so far he has quoted in support of this conclusion the evidence of one line only (A III, 30).

In his answer to M. Jusserand, who dwells, most justly, on the contradictory nature of the evidence of the MSS., Prof. Manly defends his statement thus:

'If we find that in B *she* is, according to the evidence of all extant MSS., the form of this pronoun in the source from which they are all derived, and that in A *heo* is, according to the evidence of all extant MSS., the corresponding form, we are justified in concluding that, in all probability, the authors of the two versions differed as to the form of this pronoun[1].'

But there might be considerable difference between the two versions without that difference being 'incompatible with the supposition of a single author.'

For the theory which Prof. Manly is setting himself to disprove is that of a William [Langland] connected with Shipton in Oxfordshire and Malvern in Worcestershire, both places bordering on, if not actually within, the area of Southern influence, who shortly before or shortly after writing his A version came up to London; and subsequently rewrote it after a lapse of fifteen and again of thirty years. *Ex hypothesi* we should expect certain dialectal differences between A, B, and C. We should expect the sprinkling of Southern or Western peculiarities to be most prominent in A, whilst we should expect B and C to approximate more nearly to the language of Chaucer.

Nothing would be proved if it were shown that A and B alike use both *are* and *be*, but in different proportions: or that whilst both A and B use *they, here, hem*, A has also a sprinkling of *hie* forms, which become much rarer or even disappear in B and C: or that A can be proved to have used *heo* here and there, whilst B used it rarely or not at all.

But, in point of fact, does the evidence of all the extant MSS. prove that A used *heo* and B *she*? Prof. Manly does not assert that it does, but merely what would follow if it did.

Let us take the first instance where the form occurs in the A-text.

> I was a ferd of hire face, þei3 heo fair were,
> And seide, Mercy, ma dame, what is þis to mene?
> Þe tour of þe toft, quaþ heo, treuþe is þere inne.

In this passage *heo* is the reading of four A-MSS.[2], *she, sho, che*, of eight[3].

[1] *Mod. Phil.* VII, 124.
[2] TLVH.
[3] RUEIH$_2$DgWD: W *corrupt in one line*: As *wanting*.

Nor is this an unfair example. In many of the A-MSS. *she* is used almost or quite exclusively. This does not of course prove that *heo* was not the original form in A: but it was hardly such 'according to the evidence of all the extant MSS.'

The readings of one line only are quoted by Prof. Manly in support of his thesis regarding the dialect of the MSS.; and then in order to show how B, whilst usually altering A's *heo* to *she*, has been occasionally compelled to keep it, in order to preserve the alliteration.

'In A III, 30,' says Prof. Manly, 'all the MSS. have

Hendeliche thenne heo · behihte hem the same.'

But they have not: *heo* is here the reading of five A-MSS. only[1]: *sche, sho* is the reading of eight[2].

The corresponding line of the B-text, Prof. Manly says, 'has the same form *heo*, in spite of the fact that *she* is the regular form in B for the feminine pronoun. Three MSS., indeed, COB, have *she*, but they form a small sub-group, and *she* is clearly due to a correction in their immediate source.'

Now, whether or not COB are rightly described as 'a small sub-group,' they certainly do not stand alone in reading *she* here. For this is also the reading of the two other Cambridge University MSS. Ll. 4. 14 and Gg. 4. 31; of the Corpus Coll. Oxford MS.; of Cotton Calig. A XI, and of the Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 10574. The Crowley text, founded upon a lost MS., also reads *she*; but perhaps this should not be counted. We have eight MSS., therefore, which favour the reading *she* against four[3] which have the reading *heo*.

The reason of these errors is clear. The Vernon text of A, printed by Skeat, reads *heo*: and as no variants are quoted in the critical notes Prof. Manly has, not unnaturally, assumed that all the MSS. agree in this reading. Similarly in the B-text, only COB are quoted by Skeat as differing from the Laud reading. But it must be remembered (1) that since, and largely in consequence of, Skeat's editions, many important new MSS. have been discovered; (2) that owing to the wide

[1] TH_2LVH. [2] RUEIDgWDAs.

[3] Laud 581, Rawl. Poet. 38, Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 15. 17, Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35287 (formerly Ashburnham 129). All statements as to the B-MSS. are subject to the limitation that the former Ashburnham 130, and Phillipps 8252 (both uncollated), have not yet been seen by either Mr Grattan or myself: otherwise the readings quoted are from our own examination of the MSS. Ashburnham 130 was not, as is generally supposed, acquired by the British Museum, and information as to its present position would be welcomed. The Yates Thompson MS. (now at Newnham) is defective here.

variations between the different A-MSS. it was not possible to note, in the collations, any but the more important variants: synonyms such as *ac* and *but*[1], and *sche* and *heo*, were not always noted; (3) only those MSS. which seemed most important from the point of view of fixing the text were collated: and the MS. which offers the best readings is by no means necessarily the best from the point of view of dialect.

It follows that work upon the dialect of Piers Plowman should be based upon a new and minute examination of the MSS. To Prof. Manly belongs the credit of having realized the necessity for a more elaborate collation of the A-MSS., and of having caused such an examination to be made. Had Mr Grattan and I known of this we should not have begun our work. We are glad to take this opportunity of acknowledging that to Mr Knott, who undertook the collation of the A-MSS. at the instance of Prof. Manly, belongs the credit of having been the first to examine minutely all these MSS.: a task which, thanks to Prof. Skeat's labours, is now a comparatively easy and straightforward one.

But Prof. Manly does not claim that his views as to dialect were based upon Mr Knott's collations, which have not yet been published. His assertion that his conclusions 'can be easily tested' seems to exclude the supposition of their being based upon any private or exclusive information. And, though we all know how fatally easy it is to make mistakes in collation, surely Prof. Manly is not the man to go wrong eight times out of thirteen, on the question whether *heo* or *she* is the reading of a specified line, if he had before him collations of the MSS.

But if Prof. Manly's view is based only upon published documents, then it is based almost exclusively upon Vernon; for, as has been shown above, the collations appended by Skeat to Vernon are not minute enough for dialectal investigation. And Vernon is admittedly an unsafe guide in matters of dialect.

No doubt Prof. Manly will ultimately defend his view of the dialect after an examination of all the MSS. Yet this will be but Jedburgh Justice, if, as seems to be the case, he had arrived at his conclusions before examining the evidence.

[1] See Introduction to Skeat's edition of the A-text, p. xxix.

VII. Problems of the Texts.

Prof. Manly also draws attention to metrical and alliterative differences between A, B and C[1]. But here again we are very much at the mercy of the MSS. Rosenthal long ago formed elaborate lists of all exceptional verses in A, showing how they were altered and corrected in B and C[2]. But in a large number of these instances the peculiarity is not that of A, but simply that of the Vernon MS.: the line is to be found in the great majority of A-MSS. in the same form in which it is given in B. Any statistics of metre or alliteration are without value, until we have before us full collations of all the MSS.

The same answer applies to Prof. Manly's statement that B took over 'variant readings of the A-text' unchanged from the MS. of A used as a basis. If this can be proved, it will certainly be a very strong argument. But the more the MSS. are examined the more probable does it seem that these variants from the received text of A, adopted by B, are, in fact, the true readings. That this is so in the majority of cases seems hardly to admit of dispute.

Of course it is conceivable that, when all the evidence has been sifted, a number of instances in which B *has* adopted an inferior reading will be left over, sufficient to support, if not to prove, Prof. Manly's theory. Yet the utmost caution is necessary here, lest we should make the writers of the B and C versions responsible for what, after all, are but the errors of their scribes. For no B-MS., not even the famous and excellent Laud 581, can be regarded as representing the original B-text with anything like complete accuracy. Even when supported by the great majority of the other MSS., Laud 581 is sometimes wrong. For example, in the scene of the Harrowing of Hell, Christ claims that He, the King of Kings, may save the wicked from death, since, if an earthly king comes

> There þe feloun thole sholde deth or otherwyse,
> Lawe wolde, he ȝeue hym lyf, if he loked on hym. (B xviii, 380–1.)

deth or otherwyse, the reading of Laud and the received text, can hardly be right; for the point is that even the extreme penalty may be remitted by a king. The right reading is obviously that of the C-text *deþ oþer Iuwise* (justice, execution). This is the reading of only three

[1] *Cambr. Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, vol. ii, p. 32. [2] *Anglia*, i 414 (1878).

B.-MSS., whilst Laud's corrupt reading has the support of ten[1]. It does not follow, then, that Laud's reading is necessarily right, even when supported by the great bulk of the MS. evidence.

Numerous and good as the B-MSS. are, their close agreement may be due to their being accurate transcripts of one, not always quite accurate, archetype. To arrive at the original B we must supplement the evidence of the extant MSS. by the evidence derived from C. For C, whether or not he was identical with B, must have had before him an exceedingly early MS. of B.

Two instances will serve to show how necessary caution is, in arguing as to B's textual corruption of A, or C's textual corruption of B. In A Pro. 41 some A-MSS. speak of beggars with bags *bretful* or *bredful ycrammed*, another of beggars whose bags *with bred full be cromed*. The old rule, that the harder reading is to be preferred, would lead us to suppose *bretful* (*bredful*) right; for this would easily be corrupted into *of bread full*, whilst the reverse process is hardly credible. A, then, almost certainly wrote *bretful* (*bredful*). The B-MSS. are unanimously in favour of *of bread full*[2]. It might be argued that 'the B-reviser' had before him a MS. of A with this reading, and took it over into his revised text. But when we come to the C-text we find the original reading *bretful* reappearing there. The advocates of separate authorship will have to admit that there *was* a B-MS. (viz. that used by C as a basis) which had the reading *bretful*; for the same line of argument which led us in the first place to decide that *bretful* in A could not be corrupted from *of bread full* again applies here. *Of bread full* is not, then, a genuine B-reading at all, but a very early B corruption, inherited by all extant B-MSS., but not belonging to the original B. Hence no argument can be drawn from it.

So with regard to C. Perhaps the best known textual variant in C is that in the second line of the Prologue

Y shop me in-to shrobbis

where B has, of course, *shroudes*.

It might be argued that *shrobbes* is merely a scribal blunder for *shrowdes* or *shrowde*, for the confusion of *b* and *w* is frequent and easy.

[1] *With the limitation, as before, that* Ashburnham 130 *and* Phillipps 8252 *have not been examined.* deþ or ooþer Iuwise *is the reading of* Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 15. 17, *followed by* Camb. Univ. Ll. 4. 14 *and* Gg. 4. 31. *The reading* deth or otherwyse *is followed by* Rawl. Poet. 38, Yates Thompson, Corpus Oxf. 201, Camb. Univ. Dd. 1. 17, Bodl. 814, Brit. Mus. Add. 10574, Cotton Cal. A. xi. deth oþer elles Brit. Mus. Add. 35287 (*formerly* Ashburnham 129), Crowley, ouþer oþer wise Oriel 79.

[2] Corpus Oxf. 201, Rawl. Poet. 38 *wanting*: Bodley 814, Cotton Cal. A. xi, Brit. Mus. Add. 10574 *are here C-MSS.*: Ash. 130, Phillipps, 8252, *not seen: the other nine* of bred ful.

If so, C, who adopted such a blunder in the second line of his revision, could hardly be the original poet. But is *shrobbis* a genuine C-reading at all? It is the reading of all the MSS. collated by Skeat and of others. But an examination of the uncollated C-MSS. shows five giving the reading *a shrowde* or *shrowdes*. *Shrobbis* is then presumably a corruption of an early MS. of C, from which a large number of the best C-MSS. derive: but not of the actual C-reviser[1].

VIII. Style and Views.

There remains the argument as to differences of method and interests. But what man's methods and interests are absolutely the same (and it is *absolute* agreement that is demanded) at 30, at 45, and at 60? If the discrepancies pointed out by Prof. Manly under this head are sufficient to prove anything, then no English author from before Chaucer to after William Morris can escape being divided into four or five.

And are the methods and interests of A and B different? To return for a moment to the question of A's coherency and B's incoherency. Prof. Manly summarizes a passage in B showing his incapacity for consecutive thinking. M. Jusserand replies by summarizing a passage in A, which, he claims, is equally incoherent. 'Any man's work,' retorts Prof. Manly, 'will appear incoherent in an outline which omits the links of his thought.' Precisely. But can Prof. Manly be certain that he has not overlooked the links of B's thought?

As to B being 'incapable of visualizing a group or keeping his view steady enough to imagine or depict a developing action[2]'—this is one of the points on which it is difficult to argue. Many will feel that B has shown this power, quite as strongly as A, in a number of passages, from the Rat-Parliament onwards.

[1] shrobbis *etc*, Phillipps 8231, Laud 656, Harl. 2376, Douce 104, Cott. Vesp. B. xvi, Bib. Reg. 18 B. xvii, Camb. Univ. Ff. 5. 35, Corpus Coll. Camb. 293, Trin. Coll. Dub. D. 4. 1., Camb. Univ. Add. 4325.

shrowdes, Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 35157; Add. MS. 34779 (formerly Phillipps 9056).

a schrowde, Bodl. 814; Brit. Mus. Add. 10574; Cotton Calig. A. xi.

wanting Digby 102, Digby 171, Camb. Univ. Dd. 3. 13. Ilchester *is illegible and here an A-text.* Bodley 851 *reads* schrodus, *but is corrupt and here practically a B-text.*

Phillipps 8231 has not been seen, but as it has been completely printed by Skeat this matters less than in the case of the minor MSS. The other readings are quoted from examination of the MSS. by Mr Grattan or myself. We hope, next year, to print some notes on the relationship of B and C MSS., especially in passages bearing upon problems of the A-text.

[2] *Cambridge History*, vol. ii, p. 32.

Against the fact that a careful study of the 'mental powers and qualities' of A and B has convinced Prof. Manly that these writers cannot be identical, we can only note that precisely the same study has convinced many other students of the exact contrary, and is still convincing them. Most readers have noticed some tendency towards a weakening in C: and on this Mr T. Hall has based his most interesting argument[1] as to difference of authorship. But twenty years ago Skeat anticipated this argument[2], pointing out how the pedantry of C is already manifest, though less fully developed, in B.

IX. Long Will.

It is not argued that A, B, and C are the same man, but only that the arguments so far brought forward are insufficient to prove that they are not. And we have a right to demand strong proof, for there is strong evidence, both internal and external, for William, if not William Langland, having been the author of all three versions.

The external evidence has been marshalled by M. Jusserand; it is weighty, though its exact value is difficult to gauge. But the internal evidence is probably more conclusive.

'Long Will,' says Prof. Manly, is 'obviously as much a creation of the Muse as Piers the Plowman.' But it has not been noted that the A-poet (foreseeing, it may be, the rise of the Higher Criticism, as 'B' foresaw the fall of the Abbot of Abingdon) has expressly stated that *Will* was his very name.

> A muchel man, me þouȝte, lik to my selue,
> Com *and* callide me be my kynde name.
> What art *þou*, *quaþ* I þo, *þat* my name knowist? (A IX, 61–3.)

The tall stranger is 'Thought.' Thought answers, in part, the poet's questions as to *Dowel*, *Dobet*, and *Dobest*: but the full answer can only be given by Wit, to whom Thought accordingly introduces the poet:

> Þanne Þouȝt in *þat* tyme seide þis wordis:
> Where *þat* Dowel *and* Dobet *and* Dobest beþ in londe,
> Here is Wil wolde wyte, ȝif Wit couþe hym teche. (A IX, 116–8.)

If Will is only a 'conventional name' what does the poet mean by emphasising it in this way? Surely he meant something, as Dante

[1] *Mod. Lang. Rev.* Oct. 1908.
[2] Clarendon Press edit. 1886, vol. II, p. xvi.

meant something when he called attention to his own name, uttered by Beatrice in the Earthly Paradise:

> Quando mi volsi al suon del nome mio,
> *Che di necessità qui si registra.*

'That *Will* is the name given to the figure of the dreamer by four and possibly all five of the writers' is no more 'obvious' than that Dante is the name given to the figure of the dreamer by the second of the three anonymous Florentines who respectively wrote the *Inferno*, the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso*. More than a dogmatic assertion would be necessary to prove either statement. For, before the invention of the title-page, the surest way in which an author could mark his work was by introducing his name into the body of it. And if he not only does this, but expressly insists that it is his very name, then we have evidence which it will need much to overthrow. The great majority of the English poets who lived prior to the introduction of printing, and whose names are known to us, recorded those names in the text of their poems. Cynewulf, Layamon, Orm, Robert 'of Gloucester,' Minot, Gower, Chaucer, Hoccleve, Lydgate, Ashby all did so. Where, as often, the name is put into the mouth of an imaginary character, we know quite well that the name itself is not imaginary.

Was Dan John as much a creation of the muse as the Host who demanded a tale from him[1]? Or Hoccleve as the beggar with whom he conversed[2]? Or Geoffrey as the eagle which carried him to the House of Fame?

It should also be noted that in one place the name *Will* is used in a manner incompatible with such a distinction as Prof. Manly seeks to draw, between the visionary dreamer and the writer who created him:

> þanne were marchauntis merye, many wepe for ioye,
> And ȝaf Wille for his writyng wollene cloþis,
> For[3] he coupide þus here clause þei couþe[4] hym gret mede. (A VIII, 42.)

These lines cannot refer to Will in the vision, who weeps at the bidding of Repentance, or to the figure who stands behind Piers and peeps over his shoulder at the charter. Will, in the vision, neither writes nor copies any charter. The lines have no meaning unless they mark the name of the *writer* of the vision.

We have, then, references to Will as the writer and the seer of the vision, in each of the two sections of the A-text, which Prof. Manly

[1] *The Story of Thebes* by John Lidgate in Speght's Chaucer 1598, fol. 370 b.
[2] *De Regimine Principum*, stanza 267.
[3] And for TH_2. [4] ȝeue TH_2D. EAs *wanting*.

would attribute to different authors. And in one of these passages the author incidentally refers to himself as tall, *a muchel man.*

Turning now to the B-text, we have the famous passage in which the seer of the vision says

My name is Longe Wille. (B xv, 148.)

Prof. Manly suggests that here *Long Will* is not an indication of the author's name: Long Will is 'a popular locution implying long experience and observation,' just as 'when an American replies to some statement difficult of belief by saying "I'm from Missouri, you'll have to show me" it is not safe to infer that the speaker has ever set foot in Missouri....This very common locution merely indicates that the speaker is not of a credulous nature, and thinks that the matter in point requires proof.' Now, though not from Missouri, I *do* think that the matter in point requires proof. And proof, Prof. Manly quite frankly admits, he has none. 'I know no other instance of Long Will with the meaning here suggested.'

In the absence of evidence to the contrary is it rash to assume that both A and B meant what they said?

Will-references in C Prof. Manly does not dispute: and it may be noted that we have again the reference to the height of the visionary:

Ich am...to long, leyf me, lowe for to stoupe. (C vi, 24.)

It is surely strange that B and C, whose additions, according to the separators are 'tangential' and off the point, should have developed in quite different parts of the poem the hint afforded by A. Or did A, B and C happen all to be tall men, and all fond of referring to their height?

'My name is Long Will,' says one author. We are told it is not. 'My name is Will[2],' says another. We are told it is Francis. In each case we are entitled to ask for the evidence.

Whichever way that evidence be ultimately interpreted, it will not alter the fact that to Prof. Manly all students of *Piers Plowman* are under a debt second only to that which they owe to Prof. Skeat, and to M. Jusserand. It cannot be denied that he has deserved *laudari a laudato,* to be praised by Dr Bradley as having 'initiated a new stage in the progress of Langland criticism.' But Prof. Manly would be the last to claim, on this account, that his views should be accepted without careful scrutiny. This scrutiny he has from the first invited. What the ultimate verdict will be it is impossible, as yet, to say. Years

[1] *Mod. Phil.* vii, 1. 97, 1909. [2] Shakespeare, *Sonnets* cxxxvi.

hence, when all the evidence has been sifted, it may be that Prof. Manly's view will be amply supported, and that it will be shown to be possible, or probable, if not certain, that the B and C revisers were not identical with the original author. But, at present, this view is but a theory, and rests for its support upon the following assumptions:

That the metre of B differs from that of A—a statement which, in the present condition of our texts, it is exceedingly difficult to verify: that the dialect of B differs from that of A—a statement in support of which the readings of a single line have, so far, been adduced, which readings an examination of the MSS. shows to be, in about half the instances, the exact reverse of what is stated: that A could not have associated Robert the Robber with Sloth in v, 242, although he has connected *Robert's men* with Sloth in Pro. 44–5; that he could not in v, 237 have associated 'wicked winning' with slackness in returning things borrowed, although in vii, 91–2 he has associated prompt return with 'true winning'; that he could not have allowed Sloth and Covetousness to overlap, although he has allowed every one of his other deadly sins to do so; that he could not have introduced an unnecessary character for the sake of the name in vii, 71, although he has indisputably done so in iv, 126–7; that B, who made Wrath envious cannot be the same as A, who makes Envy wrathful; that B did not understand that the feoffment covered the provinces of the Seven Sins, although he has, in point of fact, made this clearer than it was in A; that B could not in ii, 21 have used *lemman* in the sense in which he certainly used it in xiv, 299; that when B says *segges in London* he means dogs anywhere.

R. W. Chambers.

London.

Note. The *Ayenbite* has been quoted as an authority on the Sins (pp. 19, 20) because it is convenient for reference. It is, of course, only a literal and most inaccurate version of the *Somme le Roy* of Friar Laurent. (See Varnhagen in *Englische Studien*, i, 379—423; ii, 52—59.) The *Somme* has been in part printed by Evers (Erlangen, 1888), but Evers' text begins at a point subsequent to that under consideration. I have satisfied myself, however, from a comparison of the French MS. (Cotton, Cleopatra A. 5) that in the passages cited Dan Michel represents his original fairly: he is indeed more than usually accurate.

THE CHAUCERIAN 'MERCILES BEAUTE' AND THREE POEMS OF DESCHAMPS.

THE triple roundel known since Todd under the title 'Merciles Beaute' is admittedly Chaucerian in its manner, and it has been accepted as authentic by Professor Skeat[1], as well as by other authorities of note[2]. But the absence of external attestation of its genuineness, together with the fact that it exists in a unique copy, has weighed against its unqualified acceptance, and the editors of the Globe Chaucer included it among the doubtful minor poems[3]. Certain evidence, however, which I wish to present with reference to the sources of the poem seems to bear with some directness on the problem of its authenticity, as well as to throw further light on the peculiarly interesting relations between Chaucer and Deschamps.

Professor Skeat has expressed his belief that 'Merciles Beaute' was suggested by a roundel of Willamme d'Amiens, of which he quotes the first three lines[4]. The entire roundel is as follows:

Jamais ne serai saous
d'esguarder les vairs ieus dous
qui m'ont ocis.
onques mais si au desous
(jamais ne serai saous)
ne fu nus cuers amourous;
ne ja n'ert a tans rescous,
qant muir tous vis.
jamais etc.[5]

It is obvious at once that the resemblance between the two poems extends little, if at all, beyond a single phrase, and that by no means

[1] Oxford Chaucer, I, 80—81. Professor Skeat remarks: 'I ought to add that this poem is the only one which I have admitted into the set of Minor Poems.....with incomplete external evidence. If it is not Chaucer's, it is by some one who contrived to surpass him in his own style.'

[2] See, for details, Hammond, *Chaucer, A Bibliographical Manual*, New York, 1908, pp. 436—37.

[3] See Globe Chaucer, p. lii.

[4] Oxford Chaucer, I, 548.

[5] Bartsch, *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, ed. 7, col. 341.

an uncommon one[1]. A comparison of 'Merciles Beaute,' on the other hand, with two poems of Deschamps discloses parallels of marked significance.

The first is a *chançon baladée,* or *virelay*[2]. I shall place it side by side with the corresponding lines of the triple roundel:

Your yën two wol slee me sodenly;
I may the *beautè* of hem not *sustene,*

So woundeth hit through-out my herte kene.

And but your word wol helen hastily[3]
My hertes wounde, whyl that hit is grene,
Your yën two *wol slee me* sodenly...

So hath your beautè fro your herte chaced[4]
Pitee, that me ne availeth not
to pleyne;
For Daunger halt your mercy in his cheyne.

Comment pourra mon corps *durer*
Ne les douls regars *endurer*
De *voz biaux yeux*?
Se bon espoir ne me fait mieulx
Que je n'ay, *il me faut finir.*
En traiant m'ont voulu *navrer*
Jusqu'au cuer, par leur regarder
Tres perilleux;
Dont du trait ne puis *respasser,*

Mais m'en convendra trespasser.
Ayde moy, Dieux!

Fay que *Pitié* vueille garder
Et bon espoir reconforter
Mon plaint piteux;
Car se Dangier le despiteux

Me nuist, je doy bien demander
Comment pourra etc.

It is clear enough, of course, that the details of the passages just quoted are in large measure commonplaces of the *genre.* That is true of the ascription of fatal potency to the lady's eyes[5]; and the juxta-

[1] Compare, for example, the following:

Que ferai, biau sire Dieus?
Li regart de ses vairs euz,
J'atendrai pour avoir mielz ainsint,
Li regart de ses vairs euz m'ocist.
(Raynaud, *Recueil de motets français,* I, 123, No. xciv.)

And see below, n. 5.

[2] *Oeuvres complètes de Eustache Deschamps* (*Société des anc. textes fr.*), III, 382, No. 541.

[3] With this line compare not only the 'respasser' ('helen') of the *virelay,* but also l. 4: Se bon espoir ne me fait mieulx.

[4] Compare Deschamps, No. 490 (III, 314), l. 14: Et par Paour *qui enchace Pité.*

[5] It is unnecessary to exemplify it at length; it occurs frequently elsewhere in Deschamps: Par ses doulx yeux est mes cuers envais, Et si fort trais qu'il ne se puet defendre; Sanz coup ferir le fault mourir ou rendre, En vray espoir d'esperer guerison (III, 250, No. 440); Par le doulx oeil qui m'a mors de sa darde (III, 327, No. 500); De mal'eure vous regarday, Et trop persent furent li ray De vos biaux yeux pour moy ferir, Du regart desquelz me navray Tant que jamays joye n'auray Se Pitez ne me veult oyr (IV, 165, No. 524); cf. III, 285, No. 467, ll. 13—14. Add particularly another roundel which appears in *L'Art de Dictier* (VII, 286):

Vo doulz regart, douce dame, m'a mort,
S'amours ne fait que voz gentis cuers m'aint.

Quant en riant a vous amer m'amort,
Vo doulz regart, douce dame, m'a mort.

Quar je congnois en sa douçour ma mort
Pour la parfaicte amour qui en moy maint;
Vo doulz regart, douce dame, m'a mort,
S'amours ne fait que vo gentis cuers m'aint.

And see above, n. 1.

position of Pity and Danger meets one everywhere[1]. The point of real moment, however, is the close correspondence of the two poems in the order and the arrangement of the particular commonplaces in which they agree[2]. And despite the freer handling of the theme in the roundel, that correspondence is patent at a glance[3].

But this evidence, as it happens, does not stand alone. There is another fact of curious significance. The two *balades*[4] immediately preceding the *virelay* in question belong to what may be called the *marguerite* group, and there is some ground for thinking that Chaucer may have known one of them[5]. There is nothing, in other words, which runs counter to the assumption—and there is at least presumptive evidence in its favour—that the pair of *balades* just preceding the *virelay* may have been among the *euvres d'escolier* which Deschamps sent, with his compliments, to Chaucer[6]. That the *virelay* which now stands on the same folio[7] with the two *marguerite balades* was always thus associated with them, it is of course impossible to assert. But so far as the evidence of the manuscript goes, it lends distinct colour to the suggestion that the poem to which the first two sections of 'Merciles Beaute' stand in such significant relations, may have lain very close to Chaucer's hand.

And, indeed, there seems to be direct and interesting internal evidence that the writer of the triple roundel *did*, in point of fact, know not only the *virelay* but also the *marguerite balade* which just precedes it. For the 'suddenly' of the first line of the roundel, which

[1] See, for example, Deschamps, III, 372, ll. 5—6; 370, l. 7; 327, ll. 18—19; 314, ll. 13—14; 223, ll. 20—21—all within a relatively few pages of the poem in question.

[2] One should notice, however, that such a verbal parallel as that between 'sustene' and 'endurer,' in the second line of the respective poems, is wholly independent of the commonplaces as such.

[3] The fact that the greatest freedom is in the closing lines of the two sections is strikingly paralleled by Chaucer's well-known usage elsewhere. See especially Skeat's remarks on the translation of the *A B C* and the *Compleynt of Venus* (Oxford Chaucer, I, 562, under l. 79), and compare my note on Chaucer's procedure in the case of the stanzas of the *Troilus* (*Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, XX, 851, n. 1).

[4] Nos. 539 and 540. It will be remembered that the order of the edition is the order of the MS. See Raynaud in XI, 102.

[5] See *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 615, n. 3.

[6] Moreover, the third *balade* (No. 536) before the pair just mentioned is one of the two which refer directly to Sir Lewis Clifford—the other, of course, being the famous *balade* (No. 285, Vol. II, p. 138) sent to Chaucer by his hand. And I know of nothing which forbids the assumption that the two Clifford *balades* belong to the same general period. Professor Kittredge has shown (*Modern Philology*, I, 7, n. 3) that No. 536 'was not written before 1386, and...it can hardly have been written after 1392.' And on the evidence for a date not earlier than 1386 for the dispatch to England of No. 285, see *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XX, 755—71. It is possible, therefore (though I should not urge the point), that No. 536 may have had a place, originally as well as now, along with Nos. 539 and 540.

[7] Fol. 171 (see III, 380—83). No. 536 is on fol. 170.

has no counterpart in the *virelay*, parallels strikingly, taken in its context, the twelfth line of the *balade*:

. . . . . du gracieux corps gay
Dont le regart me vint soudainement[1].

And the further correspondence between line 23 of the roundel and line 15 of the *balade*—

To mercy, though he sterve for the peyne De reconfort, que je muir en tourment—

is hard to dismiss as accidental[2]. The evidence, accordingly, points with strongly cumulative effect to the *virelay* (with a hint or two from the preceding *marguerite balade*) as the inspiration of the first two sections of 'Merciles Beaute.'

This probability becomes a practical certainty when we observe that the *third* section of the triple roundel is a humorous paraphrase, in thoroughly Chaucerian vein, of another poem (this time a *rondeau*) of Deschamps:

Puis qu'Amour ay servi trestout mon temps,
Et employé cuer et corps, quanque j'ay,
S'Amour me faut, jamaiz jour n'ameray.

Joyes, deduiz, festes, esbatement,
Ay fait pour lé, mais plus ne les feray,
Puis qu'Amour ay servi trestout mon temps,
Et employé cuer et corps, quanque j'ay.

Croire ne puis qu'Amour soit si coulans,
Maiz a ce cop de certain le saray;
Et s'ainsis est, a tous amans diray:
Puis qu'Amour ay servi trestout mon temps,
Et employé cuer et corps, quanque j'ay,
S'Amour me faut, jamaiz jour n'ameray[3].

[1] I append the full text of the second stanza of the *balade* (No. 540):

Eust jamais porté ces maulx que j'ay,
A ce *nulz homs* qu'il peust nullement
Soy deporter du gracieux corps gay
Dont le regart me vint soudainement?
Certes nennil; a parler morelment,
Chastel aym tant *pour trouver seure porte*
De reconfort, que je muir en tourment
Se vo doulceur, dame, ne me conforte.

[2] Compare also the 'no man may *atteyne*' of the preceding line in the roundel with the '*trouver seure porte*' of the preceding line in the *balade*, and the 'nulz homs' of l. 10. And with 'I sey you sooth' (l. 18) compare 'De fy vous dy' in the first line of the third stanza of the *balade*.

[3] No. 570, Vol. IV, p. 29. For convenience of reference I append the third section of 'Merciles Beaute':

Sin I fro Love escaped am so fat,
I never thenk to ben in his prison lene;
Sin I am free, I counte him not a bene.

He may answere, and seye this or that;
I do no fors, I speke right as I mene.
Sin I fro Love escaped am so fat,
I never thenk to ben in his prison lene.

The themes are identical; the conventional phraseology of the *rondeau* is simply turned into the vivid and racy idiom of the roundel[1]—the same strain, one cannot but feel, that reappears, in mellower form, in the *Envoy to Scogan*[2]. And in this case, too, the position of the *rondeau* in the manuscript is curiously significant. For the third poem before it[3] *is the virelay itself* (there repeated), the relation of which to the first two sections of 'Merciles Beaute' we have already seen. Indeed, inasmuch as the *virelay* is here provided with a *Réponse*[4] (which, it will be noted, the English poem has not used), the *rondeau* is really separated from the pair by but a single poem[5]. The triple roundel, accordingly, is seen to be an adaptation, now close, now with a masterly freedom of hand, of two (or rather three) poems of Deschamps.

If our inferences so far have been sound, several interesting consequences follow. In the first place, Chaucer's authorship of 'Merciles Beaute' may be regarded as established beyond reasonable doubt. For Chaucer indubitably knew certain poems of Deschamps, and that, too, under circumstances which not only attached to them peculiar interest, but virtually challenged the transplanting of some of them into English soil[6]. And there is no evidence—or even strong probability—that any of his English contemporaries who 'made of sentement' were interested in, or even knew, Deschamps at all. That fact, taken in conjunction with what has always been felt to be the genuinely Chaucerian ring of the lines, is, I think, practically conclusive[7].

Love hath my name y-strike out of his sclat,
And he is strike out of my bokes clene
For ever-mo; [ther] is non other mene.
Sin I fro Love, etc.

[1] This is obvious enough without comment. Compare, for one example:

Love hath my name y-strike out of his sclat,
And he is strike out of my bokes clene
For ever-mo—

with the refrain:

S'Amour me faut, jamaiz jour n'ameray—

as well as with ll. 8—9 of the rondeau.

[2] 'Whyl I was yong, I putte hir forth in prees!'

[3] No. 567, Vol. IV, p. 26.

[4] No. 568: 'Réponse au précédent' (in the MS.).

[5] No. 569—another *virelay*, rehearsing the discomforts of a lover.

[6] Deschamps' well-known request for a reply in kind ('de rescripre te prie'), and his emphasis on what Chaucer had already done, in his office of 'grant translateur,' towards making known, 'en bon anglès,' the Romance of the Rose 'aux ignorans de la langue pandras'—all this has obvious pertinence in the premises. Compare *Modern Philology*, I, 6; *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 616—17, 640—41.

[7] Professor Skeat has already suggested (Oxford Chaucer, I, 81) that the echo of the *Roman de la Rose* in ll. 27—28 is in Chaucer's vein. And (it may be added) the reference to the writer's own figure is in perfect keeping with the lines of the Host and the *Envoy to Scogan*.

But that is not all. For, in the second place, brief though the poem is, it stands related to its sources in a way which bears with singular distinctness Chaucer's most individual stamp. The *Réponse*, as it happens, which Deschamps actually wrote to the *virelay*, is not only the entirely obvious and perfectly conventional reply, but it is at the same time quite out of keeping with Chaucer's own well-known attitude[1]. The next poem but one, on the other hand, *does* offer material precisely to his taste. The substitution of the theme of the *rondeau*, accordingly, for that of the *Réponse*[2], and the unexpected and piquant turn thus given to the tables[3], together with the further heightening of this turn by the racy vigour of the rendering[4], are as unmistakable, in the significance of their peculiar craftsmanship, as Giotto's O.

And finally, the results thus reached seem to throw some further light on the contents of the manuscript which came to Chaucer by the hand of Clifford. The two poems which Chaucer uses in the roundel, we may conclude with some assurance, formed part of it, together with the rejected *Réponse*[5]. Moreover, we have seen good reason for inferring that Chaucer also knew two of the poems now on the same folio with the *virelay* at the point where it makes its first appearance in the manuscript. It is scarcely going too far, then, to conclude that

[1] Its text is brief, and may be given in full:

Va, Espoir, et va Doulx Penser,
Au bel, au bon, au gent, au cler,
Au gracieux,
Au loyal, au vray amoureux,
Et li fay tout bien esperer;

Car bon renon me fait amer
Et Pité mon amy clamer
Le dolereux
Qui ne fait que grace louer.
Par honneur bien doit recouvrer
Le temps joyeux.

Pour ce je veil mon cuer donner:
Joir en puet et ordonner
Desor tous ceulx,
Maugré Dangier le dangereux,
Pour medisans faire crever.
Va Espoir, et va Doulx Penser.

[2] With the discarding of the *Réponse* compare the similar rejection in the *Troilus* of the stanzas near the beginning of the *Filostrato*, which were later used in the B-Prologue to the *Legend*. See *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 622—24.

[3] Compare the similar independence shown in the shift of speaker from the lover to the lady in Chaucer's translation of Graunson's first *balade*, in the *Compleynt of Venus*. See Oxford Chaucer, I, 87.

[4] Compare, for that, passages without number in the *Troilus!*

[5] The present position of the three poems (Nos. 567, 568, 570) on successive folios (176, 177) of the MS. strengthens the probability that they originally belonged not far apart. And No. 579 may well enough have always stood between them.

Nos. 539, 540[1] and 541 (and possibly No. 536), together with Nos. 567, 568 and 570 (and possibly No. 569), were among the *euvres d'escolier* which Deschamps sent across the Channel in company with the famous *balade*. That the *Lay de Franchise*[2] was also one of them, Chaucer's employment of it in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*[3] places beyond reasonable doubt. And it is not improbable that the four Flower and Leaf poems[4], even though they may possibly have reached Philippa of Lancaster at a slightly earlier date[5], were (perhaps for that very reason) included with the rest. I hope to show later that there is at least one other group of Deschamps' *balades* which stands in interesting relation to another of Chaucer's minor poems. But however that may be, we now have evidence enough to make it clear that Deschamps' missive did not go without some response on Chaucer's part. It is too much to hope that an *Envoy de Chaucer a Deschamps* will ever turn up. But it is scarcely an unpardonable flight of fancy to conjecture that such a poem may have been among the 'Balades, Roundels, Virelayes' that Alceste (terque quaterque beata!) was fortunate enough to know.

JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES.

SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI, U.S.A.

[1] It is perhaps worth noting that No. 540 is one of the *balades* which bears Deschamps' signature; its title being: 'Jeu de mots sur les noms de Marguerite et d'Eustache Morel, Chatelain de Fismes.' That fact, one may guess, would not render Deschamps averse to including it among the poems designed to give to Chaucer a taste of his quality. Compare the 'Eustache sui' of the Chaucer *balade* itself.

[2] II, 203 ff., No. 307.

[3] See *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 613, 615, 635—41. This evidence is even more decisive than the discussion just referred to indicates—as I hope to show in a forthcoming volume.

[4] Nos. 764—67, Vol. IV, pp. 257—64.

[5] See *Modern Philology*, I, 3—6; *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, XIX, 608—10; XX, 760.

DRUMMOND OF HAWTHORNDEN AND THE FRENCH POETS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

THE obligations of Drummond of Hawthornden to Philippe Desportes and to various poets of the Pléiade[1], remarkable as they were, by no means exhaust the amount of his debt to the French poets of the sixteenth century. Yet another French poet of that period on whom the Scottish poet levied not inconsiderable loans is Jean Passerat (1534–1602), the successor of Ramus to the chair of Latin Eloquence in the Collège de France, and one of the contributors to the *Satire Ménippée*. Passerat first appeared as a poet in the vernacular in the year 1559 with one or two trifles of no importance. It was not till 1597 that he issued a collection of his stray pieces under the title *Le Premier Livre des Poëmes de Jean Passerat*. This volume was followed by two almost simultaneous editions of *Recueil des Oeuures poëtiques de Jan Passerat*, both published in 1606, the very year that Drummond left Scotland for Bourges, with the intention, like so many other young Scots before him, of studying jurisprudence at that famous school of law, where, it may be noted, Passerat had himself followed the lectures of the renowned Cujas some forty years previously.

The most striking feature of Passerat's best verse is its 'élégant badinage,' as well as its sly humour and delicate irony, which give the impression of a contemporary of Clément Marot rather than of Ronsard. He also recalls the poet of Cahors in such pieces as *La Métamorphose d'un homme en oiseau*, a real *conte* in verse, in the pretty *vilanelle: j'ay perdu ma tourterelle*, known to all readers of French literature; while in such pieces as the ode on May-day, Passerat showed that native charm and grace were still able to give new life to well-worn themes.

This aspect of Passerat's poetic talent—we use the word advisedly for Passerat was never more than a minor poet who penned his occasional pieces as a relaxation from more serious studies—has been abundantly

[1] Cf. *Modern Language Review*, Oct., 1907, and April, 1909.

emphasised from the day that Sainte-Beuve wrote his admirable appreciation in the famous *Tableau*. The Marotic and Gallic note is undoubtedly characteristic of Passerat's best verse. But what is incomprehensible to anyone who takes the trouble to read his French poetry in the handy and accessible edition published by Prosper Blanchemain in 1880[1] is that critics and historians of French literature[2], without exception, should have completely overlooked the fact that in a much greater proportion of his work Passerat is an exotic poet, entirely dominated by foreign influences, and bent on following the latest literary fashion. In at least half of his work Passerat is a thorough-going Italianate, as Francesco Flamini was, I believe, the first to point out[3], though only summarily. He certainly undertook the usual Italian journey, in spite of what his latest biographer says[4]; and there is extant an ode of his on Henry III's entry into Ferrara which was manifestly written there, and presented to the king in Ferrara itself. He cultivated the sonnet, of which he left over one hundred and seventy specimens, in preference to all other forms. He was a diligent reader of Ariosto, and alludes familiarly to the characters of the *Orlando Furioso* (I, p. 175). But in spite of his admiration for Ariosto, he may more truly be described as an adherent of the school of Petrarch, or rather of the master's degenerate disciples at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, who are known by the collective title of *quattrocento*[5], and who included in their ranks, Cariteo, Tebaldeo, Pamfilo Sasso, Serafino of Aquila, besides a host of more insignificant versifiers. It is not our intention, nor would it be here a fitting place, to enter into a detailed consideration of the poets who composed that group. Suffice it to say that these facile improvisers, for such they were for the most part,

[1] *Les Poësies françaises de Jean Passerat, publiées avec Notice et Notes par Prosper Blanchemain*, Paris, 1880. The quotations are according to this edition.

[2] Compare Morf for example, and Tilley.

[3] *Di alcune inosservate imitazioni italiane in poeti francesi del cinquecento*, in the *Atti del Congresso internazionale di Scienze storiche*, vol. IV, Roma, 1904. Cf. also J. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e siècle*, Montpellier-Paris, 1909, an admirable work, which completely replaces Piéri.

[4] Edgar von Mojsisovics, *Jean Passerat, sein Leben und seine Persönlichkeit*, Halle, 1907, p. 20. Mojsisovics overlooks the all-important fact that Passerat alludes in no uncertain terms to the Italian journey in one of the sonnets (II, p. 72):

> Retournant d'Italie au bel air de la France
> Quelquefois à part moy ie discourois ainsi :
> I'y trouueray la pais, & mon repos aussi,
> Et verray tout fleurir en bonne intelligence.

[5] On the *Quattrocento*, see: Alessandro d' Ancona, *Del secentismo nella poesia cortigiana del secolo XV*, in *Studj sulla letteratura italiana de' primi secoli*, 1884, Ancona; *Le Rime del Chariteo a cura di Erasmo Pèrcopo* (*Biblioteca napoletana di storia e letteratura*), Naples, 1892; and Philippe Monnier, *Le Quattrocento*, Paris, 1901.

carried the conceits and hyperboles of the Petrarchists to lengths undreamt of by the great Florentine, and substituted for much of his idealism a frank and shameless appeal to sensuality in the thousands of sonnets and *strambotti* which flowed in an endless stream from their pens during the first three decades of the sixteenth century, till the purer taste and more severe style of Bembo and Sannazaro checked their progress. However, the appeal to Petrarch as the sole and unique model which the Bembists preached and practised, after a triumph extending over some thirty years, was in its turn challenged in the last quarter of the sixteenth century by the Neapolitan Angelo di Costanzo, who with greater taste and talent gave new life to the preciosity of the *quattrocento*, and by so doing prepared its complete and renewed efflorescence in the pages of yet another Neapolitan—Giambattista Marino, the author of *l'Adone*. In France, the same developments, roughly, are discernible, among the sonneteers especially, eager to follow in the footsteps of their models on the other side of the Alps, though, like most observers of foreign fashions, they were naturally always a little late in detecting its varying manifestations. During the time that Passerat was inditing his poetry his friend Desportes of all French Italianates was the one most in view and who counted the greatest number of admirers. By his shameless thefts from Tebaldeo, Pamfilo Sasso, and Angelo di Costanzo —his three favourite models—he had re-introduced the manner of the *quattrocento*, abandoned or neglected in France since the day of Melin de Saint-Galais and Clément Marot, with such effect, that even Ronsard had felt compelled to follow the vogue in the *Amours d'Hélène*. No wonder then that Passerat, the Italianate, was carried away by the general current. But instead of copying his models, like Desportes and others, he was content to assimilate them, so that not a single case of actual plagiarism can be laid at his door. How thoroughly he was steeped in the manner of the *quattrocento* is at once manifest from an examination of a few of his typical sonnets. For having loved his lady too well the poet dies a double death; he is scorched by his own sighs and drowned in his own tears (I, p. 192). One day he finds her weeping and kisses away her tears in order to staunch, as he thinks, his thirst in the pearly liquid of candied sugar. But Cupid has so much power over nature that he can change water into flames. His mistress may weep; no more will he kiss those eyes that have betrayed him:

> Or pleurez vostre saoul: ie ne veus plus baiser
> Les yeus qui m'ont trahi pensant les appaiser;
> C'est un trop aspre feu que des pleurs d'vne femme. (I, p. 195.)

Another day it is the distracted lover's eyes that run with tears. Must he chide them? No, for the fierce fire of love would have reduced him to ashes if his eyes had not watered him with two briny streams (II, p. 12). On another occasion the poet meets Cupid sobbing and lamenting that the cunning Mercury has extinguished his torch and robbed him of his shafts. 'Child,' exclaims the lover, 'stay your sobs':

> Enfant, appaise-toy: ce dis-ie au Dieu d'aimer:
> Tu pourras aisément ton flambeau ralumer
> A ce clair feu qui luit ès beaus yeus de ma dame.
> Et pour remplir ta trousse, il ne faut qu'arracher
> Tant de traits qu'il t'a plu contre moy descocher:
> Mais va-t'en les lancer autre part qu'en mon ame.

The fatal day has come; Death has enfolded his Princess in its murky shroud. Cupid the conqueror is vanquished. He breaks his bow and arrow in a thousand pieces and falls fainting on the sward. He sheds so many tears that he 'Kindles his grief and extinguishes his torch' (II, p. 74). 'Twere in vain to search the entrails of the earth for any stone whereof to build the darling's tomb. The work could be entrusted to no living sculptor. It is no task for the hands but for the eyes: the lover will erect a monument for so perfect a lady out of the crystal of his frozen tears, so that his Love may be enchased in tears (II, p. 77). Never in their most unbridled mood did any of the Quattrocentists indulge in more extravagant conceits. Even the famous Serafino would have been compelled to acknowledge that he had been at least equalled, if not surpassed, on his own ground by the skill of this wonderful virtuoso. Whether Passerat compares Cupid to a fisherman (II, p. 8), to a wolf (II, p. 20), or to a Will-o'-the-Wisp (*ibid.*), or whether he pens sonnets on mirrors, gloves and rings, in the manner of the poet of Aquila, he betrays the same infatuation for the antitheses and hyperboles of the *quattrocento*. That a man endowed, as Passerat undoubtedly was, with a rich fund of native good sense could have written such extraordinary stuff is indeed surprising, but whatever its value may be, it constitutes a large part of his poetic output and one that has been strangely neglected. This must be my excuse for having dwelt at some length on this aspect of his poetry.

In spite of Drummond's predilection for Italian literature, he was too great an artist to be attracted by the eccentricities of the *quattrocento*; when he came to read Passerat he was careful to pick out for imitation the few of his sonnets which are comparatively free from the extravagancies we have noted.

Sonnet X, a fairly close rendering, adapts the *Sonet à la Lune* (I, p. 173) with the Scottish poet's usual felicity[1]:

Fair moon, who with thy cold and silver shine
Makes sweet the horror of the dreadful night
Delighting the weak eye with smiles divine
Which Phoebus dazzles with his too much light;
Bright queen of the first Heaven, if in thy shrine,
By turning oft, and Heaven's eternal might,
Thou hast not yet that once sweet fire of thine,
Endymion, forgot, and lover's plight;
If cause like thine may pity breed in thee,
And pity somewhat else to it obtain,
Since then thou hast power of dreams, as well as he
Who paints strange figures in the slumb'ring brain,
Now while she sleeps, in doleful guise her show
Those tears, and the black map of all my woe.

O bel œil de la nuict; o la fille argentée,
Et la sœur du soleil & la mere des mois:
O Princesse des monts, des fleuves, & des bois
Dont la triple puissance en tous lieus est vantée.
Puisque tu es, Deesse, au plus bas Ciel montee
D'où les piteus regrets des amants tu reçois;
Di, Lune au front cornu, as tu veu quelquefois
Vne ame qui d'Amour fust si fort tourmentée?
Si doncques ma douleur vient ton cœur esmouvoir,
Tu me peus secourir; ayant en ton pouuoir
Des songes emplumez la bande charmeresse.
Choisi l'vn d'entre tous qui les maus d'vn amant
Sache mieus contrefaire & l'enuoye en dormant
Representer ma peine à ma fiere maistresse.

Sonnet II is also constructed on the pattern of another sonnet of the French poet (I, p. 189), except that in this case the resemblance in particulars does not extend beyond the first quatrain:

I know that all beneath the moon decays,
And what by mortals in this world is brought,
In Time's great periods shall return to nought;
That fairest states have fatal nights and days.

Je sçay bien qu'icy bas rien ferme ne demeure:
Qu'il y a des estats vn fatal changement:
Que tout aura sa fin qui a commencement:
Et que tout ce qui naist il faut aussi qu'il meure.

Drummond also drew on Passerat for the matter of a considerable number of his *Epigrams and Madrigals*. In *The Author's Life*, prefixed to the folio edition of his works (Edinburgh, 1711, p. 5), Drummond is credited with the saying that he was 'the first in the Isle who Englished the madrigal[2].' Though he may claim to have composed a larger

[1] Drummond is quoted according to W. M. C. Ward's edition, London, 1894.

[2] It is difficult, in the face of certain remarks of his (in the Folio edition, p. 226) on Alexander's *Aurora*, to account for Drummond's claim, unless he meant that he was the first to really naturalise the madrigal: 'Among our English poets Petrarch is imitated,

number than his English predecessors in that kind of poetry, his assertion, if indeed it is authentic, is hardly correct. In 1590, many years before the Scottish poet had started writing, appeared the *Italian Madrigalls Englished* of Watson. There are also two madrigals, though one only bears that name, in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*. Barnes's long-winded series of love-poems, issued in May 1593, under the title *Parthenophil and Parthenope*, contains twenty-five madrigals—longer and more loosely constructed than the average Italian poems of that kind. Moreover it should be noted that Drummond's friend, Alexander of Menstrie, had included a certain number of madrigals in his sonnet-sequence *Aurora*, published in 1604, nine years before any of his younger rival's verse had seen the day.

Drummond's chief models for the madrigal were the Italians naturally—particularly Tasso, Guarini, and Marino—but he would frequently take any short piece from another source and transform it into a madrigal, as in the following instance, in which a quatrain of Passerat (II, p. 138) is so treated:

World, wonder not that I
Engrave thus in my breast
This angel face which me bereaves of rest;
Since things even wanting sense cannot deny
To lodge so dear a guest,
And this hard marble stone
Receives the same, and loves, but cannot groan.

De sa ieune beauté si ie suis tant espris,
Et si en mon cœur tendre elle entre par la veuë,
Ce n'est pas grand' merveille, & n'en seray repris,
Puis que le marbre dur dedans soy l'a receuë.

In the same way a huitain (II, p. 48) may be handled:

Leave, page, that slender torch,
And in this gloomy night
Let only shine the light
Of love's hot brandon, which my heart doth scorch:
A sigh, or blast of wind,
My tears, or drops of rain,
May that at once make blind;
Whilst this, like Aetna, burning shall remain.

Retourne-t'en, laquais, retourne Coridon:
Il n'est point de besoin qu'on me vienne conduire,
Je suis accompagné du feu de Cupidon,
Qui la nuict m'esclairant autre feu ne desire.
Le grand vent & la pluye à ta torche peut nuire,
Mais moy ie les deffie & ne crains leur effort,
Car la flamme qu'Amour dedans mon cœur fait luire
Ne se peut amortir que par la seule mort.

nay surpassed in some things, in matter and manner: in matter, none approach him to Sidney, who hath songs and sonnets intermingled: in manner, the nearest I find to him is Sir William Alexander, who, insisting in these same steps, hath sextains, madrigals, and songs, echoes and equivoques, which he (Petrarch) hath not; whereby, as the one hath surpassed him in matter, so the other in manner of writing, or form.'

Occasionally the madrigal is condensed from a much longer poem, as in *Armeline's Epitaph* (I, p. 165) which is adapted from Passerat's *Epitaphe du Barbichon de Madame de Villeroy* (II, p. 126).

This process, however, is not confined to the madrigals; the piece on the death of a certain judge (I, p. 171), reproduced in somewhat different form in the *Epitaphs* (II, p. 182), is obviously constructed on the pattern of the following huitain (II, p. 118):

Then death thee hath beguiled,
Alecto's first-born child;
Thou who didst thrall all laws
Then against worms canst not maintain thy cause;
Yet worms, more just than thou, now do no wrong,
Sith all do wonder they thee spar'd so long,
For though from life but lately thou didst pass,
Ten springs are gone since thou corrupted was.

Passant ne sonne mot: icy dort maintenant
Quelcun qui fut iadis trop esueillé pour prendre.
Ie croirois aisément que ce fut en prenant
Que la mort qui prent tout le prist à iamais rendre.
Ce preneur ainsi pris s'en va deuenir cendre:
Et ie treuue vn grand cas que tant viure il a pu:
A ce que ses faueurs ont par tout fait entendre,
Plus de trente ans y a qu'il estoit corrompu.

In the *Miscellanies*, the short poem entitled *On a Glass sent to his best Beloved* (II, p. 136), offers an interesting example of another of the Scottish poet's methods of adaptation; in this instance he has taken the central idea of the original and condensed a somewhat loose sonnet (II, p. 41) into a neat sixain. Again one of the *Fragments* which Ward prints in the *Miscellanies* (II, p. 135) is a faithful rendering of a passage of one of Passerat's longer elegies (II, p. 88):

It autumn was, and cheerful chanticleer
Had warn'd the world twice that the day drew near;
The three parts of the night almost were spent,
When I, poor wretch, with love and fortune rent,
Began my eyes to close, and sweetest sleep,
Charming my sense, all over me did creep;
But scarce with Lethe drops and rod of gold
Had he me made a piece of breathing mould.

Nous estions en Autonne; & ià l'oiseau cresté
Qui anonce le iour, deus fois auoit chanté:
Les trois parts de la nuit estoient quasi passées:
Quand las & trauaillé d'amoureuses pensées,
Ie receu le sommeil, qui coullant gracieus
Fit cesser les ennuis de mon cœur soucieus.
A grand' peine auoit-il mes paupieres fermées
De sa baguette d'or, & de liqueurs charmées
Arrouse mon cerueau.

This list, long as it is, does not exhaust Drummond's obligations to the learned professor; in the *Satires and Epigrams*, the lampoon—

some 120 rhyming couplets—which appears under the rubric *The Character of an Anti-Covenanter, or Malignant* (II, p. 189), written in an ironical vein as an outlet for the poet's pent-up rage and indignation at a time when he had been compelled to subscribe himself publicly an adherent of a cause he hated (this I conceive is the right interpretation), is modelled, both as regards matter and form, on some biting verses which Passerat composed for the *Satire Ménippée*[1] (ed. M. C. Read, p. 220).

The opening lines are quoted in illustration:

Would you know these royal knaves
Of freemen would turn us slaves;
Who our union do defame
With rebellion's wicked name?
Read these verses, and ye will spring them,
Then on gibbets straight cause hing them.
They complain of sin and folly,
In these times, so passing holy,
They their substance will not give,
Libertines that we may live.

Pour connoistre les Politiques,
Adherents, Fauteurs d'Heretiques,
Tant soient-ils cachez et couvers,
Il ne faut que lire ces vers.
Qui se plaint du temps et des hommes,
En ce siecle d'or où nous sommes;
Qui ne veut donner tout le sien,
A ceste cause il ne vaut rien.

Two of Drummond's longer poems also turn out to be imitations, or rather close translations, from the same French poet. The first of these, *Phyllis, on the Death of her Sparrow* (II, p. 158), which Ward thinks was probably suggested by Skelton's *Litle Boke of Philip Sparrow*, is taken almost verbatim from the following composition, entitled *Élégie* (I, p. 56), belonging to that numerous class of poems on pet animals[2] which the French poets of the sixteenth century, and none more than Passerat, felt bound to attempt in imitation of Catullus and the poets of the Anthology.

Ah! if ye ask, my friends, why this salt shower
My blubber'd eyes upon this paper pour,
Gone is my sparrow; he whom I did train,
And turn'd so toward, by a cat is slain.
No more with trembling wings shall he attend
His watchful mistress: would my life could end!

Demandez-vous, Amis, d'où viennent tant de larmes
Que me voyez rouler sur ces funebres carmes?
Mon Passereau est mort, qui fut si bien appris:
Helas! c'est faict de luy, vne Chate l'a pris.
Ie ne le verray plus en sautelant me suiure:
Or' le iour me deplaist, or' ie suis las de viure.

[1] That Drummond was familiar with the *Satire Ménippée* is proved by his pointed allusion to the 'dangerous figs of Spain,' in the satire on *The Five Senses* (II, p. 186), a severe exposure of the vices of King James.

[2] For a list of such pieces, see: Blanchemain's *Œuvres Complètes de Melin de Sainct-Gelays*, I, p. 57, and Chamard's *Joachim du Bellay*, p. 405.

No more shall I him hear chirp pretty lays;
Have I not cause to loath my tedious days?
A Daedalus he was to catch a fly,
Nor wrath nor rancour men in him could spy;
To touch or wrong his tail if any dar'd,
He pinch'd their fingers, and against them warr'd:
Then might that crest be seen shake up and down,
Which fixed was unto his little crown;
Like Hector's, Troy's strong bulwark, when in ire.
He raged to set the Grecian fleet on fire.
But, ah, alas! a cat this prey espies,
Then with a leap did thus our joys surprise.
Undoubtedly this bird was kill'd by treason,
Or otherwise had of that fiend had reason.
Thus was Achilles by weak Paris slain,
And stout Camilla fell by Aruns vain:
So that false horse, which Pallas rais'd 'gainst Troy,
King Priam and that city did destroy.
Thou now, whose heart is big with this frail glory,
Shalt not live long to tell thy honour's story.
If any knowledge resteth after death
If ghosts of birds, when they have left to breathe,
My darling's ghost shall know in lower place,
The vengeance falling on the cattish race.
For never cat nor catling I shall find,
But mew shall they in Pluto's palace blind.
Ye who with gaudy wings and bodies light
Do dint the air, turn hitherwards your flight,
To my sad tears comply these notes of yours,
Unto his idol bring an harv'st of flowers;
Let him accept from us, as most divine,
Sabaean incense, milk, food, sweetest wine;

Plus donc ie ne l'orray chanter son pilleri?
Et n'ay-ie pas raison d'en estre bien marri?
Il estoit passé maistre à croquer vne mousche:
Il n'estoit point gourmand, cholere ny farousche,
Si on ne l'attaquoit pour sa queue outrager:
Lors il pinçoit les doigts, ardent à se vanger.
Adonc vous l'eussiez veu crouller la rouge creste
Attachée au sommet de sa petite teste;
Tel que l'on veit Hector, mur de ses citoyens,
Dedans les Grecques naufs lancer les feux Troyens.
Toutesfois vne Chate, espiant ceste proye,
D'vn Sault, à gueule bée, engloutit nostre ioye.
Le pauuret, pour certain, fut pris en trahison,
Autrement de la Chate il eust eu sa raison.
Le pasteur Phrygien ainsi vainquit Achille,
Et le vain Geneuois la vaillante Camille.
Ainsi le grand cheual que Pallas charpenta
Contre le vieil Priam des soldats enfanta.
Toy qui en as le cœur enflé de vaine gloire,
Bien peu te durera l'honneur de ta victoire.
Si quelque sentiment reste apres le trespas
Aux espris des oiseaux qui trebuschent là bas.
L'ame de mon mignon se sentira vengée
Sur le sang ennemy de la Chate enragée.
Ie ne rencontreray ny Chate ny Chaton
Que ie n'enuoye apres miauler chez Pluton.
Vous qui volez par l'air entendans les nouvelles
De ceste digne mort, tournez icy vos aelles;
Venez, piteux oiseaux, accompagner mes pleurs,
Portons à son idole vne moisson de fleurs.
Qu'il reçoiue de nous vne agreable offrande
De vin doux & de laict, d'encens & de viande:

And on a stone let us these words engrave :
'Pilgrim, the body of a sparrow brave
In a fierce gluttonous cat's womb clos'd remains,
Whose ghost now graceth the Elysian plains.'

Puis engrauons ces mots sur son vuide tombeau :
Passant, le petit corps d'vn gentil Passereau
Gist au ventre goulu d'vne Chate inhumaine,
Aux champs Elysiens son Ombre se proumeine.

An equally charming composition of Passerat (I, p. 141) is reproduced with no less literalness in the pastoral song *Phyllis and Damon* :

Ph. Shepherd, dost thou love me well ?
Da. Better than weak words can tell.
Ph. Like to what, good shepherd, say ?
Da. Like to thee, fair, cruel may.
Ph. O how strange these words I find !
Yet, to satisfy my mind,
Shepherd, without mocking me,
Have I any love for thee,
Like to what, good shepherd, say ?
Da. Like to thee, fair, cruel may.
Ph. Better answer had it been
To say thou lov'd me as thine eyne.
Da. Woe is me, these I love not,
For by them love entrance got,
At that time they did behold
Thy sweet face and locks of gold.
Ph. Like to what, dear shepherd, say ?
Da. Like to thee, fair, cruel may.
Ph. Once, dear shepherd, speak more plain,
And I shall not ask again ;
Say, to end this gentle strife,
Dost thou love me as thy life ?
Da. No, for it is turn'd a slave
To sad annoys, and what I have
Of life by love's stronger force
Is reft, and I'm but a dead corse.
Ph. Like to what, good shepherd, say ?
Da. Like to thee, fair, cruel may.
Ph. Leave, I pray, this like to thee,
And say, I love as I do me.
Da. Alas ! I do not love myself,
For I'm split on beauty's shelf.
Ph. Like to what, good shepherd, say ?
Da. Like to thee, fair, cruel may.

Elle. Pastoureau, m'aimes-tu bien ?
Lui. Je t'aime, Dieu sçait combien.
Elle. Comme quoi ?
Lui. Comme toi,
Ma rebelle
Pastourelle.
Elle. En rien ne m'a contenté
Ce propos trop affetté,
Pastoureau, sans moquerie
M'aimes-tu ? di, ie te prie.
Comme quoi ?
Lui. Comme toi,
Ma rebelle
Pastourelle.
Elle. Tu m'eusses répondu mieus,
Ie t'aime comme mes yeux.
Lui. Trop de haine ie leur porte :
Car ils ont ouuert la porte
Aus peines que i'ay receu,
Des lors que ie t'apperçeu :
Quand ma liberté fut prise
De ton œil qui me maistrise.
Elle. Comme quoi ?
Lui. Comme toi,
Ma rebelle
Pastourelle.
Elle. Pastoureau, parle autrement
Et me di tout rondement,
M'aimes tu comme ta vie ?
Lui. Non, car elle est asseruie
A cent & cent mille ennuis,
Dont aimer ie ne la puis,
N'estant plus qu'vn corps sans ame
Pour trop cherir vne dame.
Elle. Comme quoi ?
Lui. Comme toi,
Ma rebelle
Pastourelle.
Elle. Laisse la ce Comme toi :
Di, ie t'aime comme moi.
Lui. Ie ne m'aime pas moy-mesmes.
Elle. Di moy doncques, si tu m'aimes,
Comme quoi ?
Lui. Comme toi,
Ma rebelle
Pastourelle.

It would have been strange indeed if the Scottish poet, addicted as he was to the transmutation of foreign material into his poetry, could have resisted the attraction of Du Bartas, especially at a time when the author of the *Sepmaine* was undoubtedly more largely read in England than in his native country. There is evidence that Drummond had read Du Bartas, or at least part of his works, as early as 1609. In a letter written three years later, describing his first meeting with Alexander of Menstrie, and alluding to the latter's *Doomesday* which had not yet appeared in print, he says of his new acquaintance: 'This much I will say, and perchance not without reason dare say, if the heavens prolong his days to end his Day he hath done more in one Day than Tasso did all his life, and Bartas in his two weeks, though both the one and the other be most praiseworthy.' Now this passage reproduces almost verbatim the words which Simon Goulart, the commentator of the *Sepmaines*, ascribes to Ronsard after the publication of the first *Sepmaine*—'M. du Bartas a plus faict en une sepmaine que je n'ai faict en toute ma vie.' A detail of this kind, insignificant in itself, argues great familiarity with the writings of the Huguenot poet and all that concern them[1]. Drummond had also read Sylvester, and although he had no great opinion of his first-hand attempts, he praises his translations from Du Bartas unstintingly and compares them with those of Hudson to the discredit of the latter (Folio ed., p. 227). His admiration for the French poet took concrete form in more than one poem of the *Flowers of Sion* (1623). *An Hymn of the Fairest Fair*, for example, clearly betrays that he was fresh from the reading of the *Sepmaine* when he composed such passages as the following. The same metre is used (heroic couplet); the same compounds abused, and the same elaborate comparisons from contemporary science:

> Amidst these sapphire far-extended heights
> The never-twinkling, ever-wand'ring lights
> Their fixed motions keep; one dry and cold,
> Deep-leaden colour'd, slowly there is roll'd;
> With rule and line for time's steps measur'd even
> In twice three lustres he but turns his heaven.
> With temperate qualities and countenance fair
> Still mildly smiling, sweetly debonair,
> Another cheers the world, and way doth make
> In twice six autumns through the zodiac.
> But hot and dry, with flaming locks and brows
> Enrag'd, this in his red pavilion glows.
> Together running with like speed, if space,
> Two equally in hands achieve their race;

[1] See Georges Pellissier, *La Vie et les Œuvres de Du Bartas*, Paris, 1883, p. 277.

With blushing face this oft doth bring the day,
And ushers oft to stately stars the way;
That various in virtue, changing, light,
With his small flame ingems the veil of night.

The Shadow of Judgment, in the same collection, was a theme that lent itself still more readily to the inditing of verse in the manner and spirit of Du Bartas and Sylvester. Indeed, a passage describing the three Furies—War, Famine, and Pestilence—is little more than an amplification or paraphrase of the corresponding lines in the French original. The fact that King James had translated this portion of the *Sepmaine*[1] may have served as an additional inducement to Drummond to produce a fresh version of one of his favourite passages. The description of Famine from both poets is given in order to give an idea of the parallelism:

The next, with eyes sunk hollow in her brains,
Lean face, gnarl'd hair, with black and empty veins,
Her dried-up bones scarce covered with her skin,
Bewraying that strange structure built within,
Thigh-bellyless, most ghastly to the sight,
A wasted skeleton resembleth right.
Where she doth roam, in air faint do the birds,
Yawn do earth's ruthless brood and harmless herds;
The woods' wild foragers do howl and roar,
The humid swimmers die along the shore;
In towns, the living do the dead up-eat,
Then die themselves; alas! and wanting meat,
Mothers not spare the birth of their own wombs,
But turn those nests of life to fatal tombs.

Voicy venir la Faim, vray pourtrait d'Atropos.
Son noir cuir est percé des poinctes de ses os,
Elle baaille toujours; l'œil au crane lui touche,
Et l'une ioue à l'autre. On voit dedans sa bouche
Iaunir ses claires dents, et les vuides boyaux
Paroissent à travers les rides de ses peaux.
Pour ventre elle n'a point que du ventre la place;
Ses coudes et genoux s'enflent sur la carcasse;
Insatiable monstre, à qui pour vn repas
A peine suffiront tout ce qui vit ça bas.
Son gosier va cerchant la viande ès viandes;
L'vn mets l'autre semond; ses entrailles gourmandes
Se vuident en mangeant. De ses enfans la chair
Son enragé désir ne peut mesme estancher.

Indications are also not wanting that Drummond had studied the *Sepmaine contre le sieur du Bartas* of Christophe de Gamon (1609), in praise of which little can be said, even after Raymond Toinet's careful

[1] James's version of *The Furies*, his *Lepanto*, and Du Bartas's rendering of the latter production, were published together in *His Maiesties Poeticall Exercises at vacant houres* (1591).

study of him and his likes[1]. Gamon's turgid epic appears in the lists of books read by the laird of Hawthornden in the year 1614.

Lastly, a curious example of Drummond's dependence on foreign models may be instanced. In his *Posthumous Poems* (II, p. 121) occur two Italian sonnets in the vernacular—one by Tebaldeo and the other by Bembo—to each of which three different translations, varying in literalness, are appended. Now if the reader will turn to Bk VII, ch. VIII, of the *Recherches de la France* of Étienne Pasquier he will find the same two Italian sonnets cited each with three separate translations conjoined, and moreover discover that Drummond's versions are modelled on those given by Pasquier. An absolute proof that we are here in presence of the Scottish poet's source is afforded by the fact that in the Hawthornden MS. from which David Laing (*Arch. Scot.*, IV, p. 226) took these sonnets, the one of Tebaldeo is entitled by Drummond 'Sonnet qu'un Poëte Italien fit pour un bracelet de cheveux qui lui avoit esté donné par sa Maistresse'—which are the exact words used by Pasquier himself to introduce the Italian poet's composition.

From the same author is taken *A Couplet Encomiastic* (I, p. 169), the original of which Pasquier quotes in the *Recherches* as the earliest example in French of quantitative verse, or *vers mesurés* as they were then called.

To complete the list it may be pointed out that the piece entitled *Statue of Venus Sleeping* (II, p. 144) is translated from *Les Touches* (1585) of Tabourot or Le Seigneur des Accords, as he preferred to style himself, a collection of epigrams of no great value. Tabourot is also the author of *Les Bigarrures* (1581), consisting of essays on various artificial forms of verse with chapters on anagrams and epitaphs. This latter work which would have done more honour to a disciple of the *Grands rhétoriqueurs* than to a writer composing when the Pléiade was at the height of its fame, was utilised by Drummond in his prose essay on the *Character of a Perfect Anagram* (Folio ed., p. 230). From the same source Drummond no doubt also derived the idea of the 'pyramid' in verse which accompanied the first edition (1613) of *Teares on the Death of Meliades*, though he may of course have read about such puerilities as the *pyramis*, the *fuzie*, the *lozange*, and the like in the *Arte of English Poesie* attributed to Puttenham.

[1] *Notes pour servir à l'histoire littéraire du XVII^e siècle. Quelques recherches autour des poèmes héroïques-épiques français du XVII^e siècle*, Tulle, 1899. Compare also A. Mazon, *Notice sur la vie et les œuvres d'Achille Gamon et de Christophle (sic) de Gamon d'Annonay en Vivarais*, Lyon-Paris MDCCCLXXXV, and the inevitable German thesis: H. Kaiser, *Über die Schöpfungsgedichte des Gamon und D'Aubigné und ihre Beziehungen zu Du Bartas' Sepmaine*, Bremen, 1896.

To the reading of French authors must also be ascribed Drummond's liberal use of French words—*decore*, I, 9 and I, 70, *vively*, I, 58, *phare*, I, 65, *ramage* (warbling), I, 115, *paragon'd*, I, 196, *ordure*, II, 13 and II, 66, *vive*, II, 21, *collin* (hill), II, 66, *trunchman*[1] (interpreter), II, 274. His fondness for verbs composed with the prefix *em-*, *en-*, or *im-* ('ensphere,' 'encheer,' 'embower,' 'impurple,' 'ensaffron,' 'empamper,' 'incluster,' etc.) was probably encouraged by one of the methods of *provignement* much favoured by the Pléiade; and one of his faults, his habit of inversions, especially in the case of pronouns, may in the same way be put down to early familiarity with French poetry.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

[1] Ward commits a startling error *à propos* of the word *trunchman*, which by the way occurs in the *Cypress Grove* appended to the *Poems* (II, p. 274). In a note he says: '*Trunchman:* perhaps one who holds the truncheon as a symbol of command.' This of course is nonsense. The word 'interpreter' with which 'trunchman' is immediately conjoined in Drummond's text ought to have shown Ward that we are here in presence of the French word *trucheman* (or *truchement*, to use the more modern spelling admitted by the Academy), of Arabic origin, meaning an 'interpreter.' One naturally recalls Molière's 'Où est le truchement, pour lui dire qui vous êtes?' (*B. gent.* v, 4).

THE BOULOGNE MANUSCRIPT OF THE 'CHEVALERIE VIVIEN.'

THE manuscript 192, called Sancti Bertini, of the city library of Boulogne-sur-Mer is one of the most valuable cyclic manuscripts of the *Geste de Guillaume*. This manuscript, according to an inscription at the close, was finished in the month of April, 1295[1], and is thus one of the oldest dated manuscripts of chansons de geste[2]. The *Chevalerie Vivien* occupies folios 81 verso to 93 recto, and numbers 1840 lines. The published edition of Jonckbloet[3] numbers 1918 lines, and is based on two poor manuscripts, 774 and 368 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The manuscript Sancti Bertini is like most of the other manuscripts of the *Chevalerie* in assonance, but stands alone in ending the *laisses* with the *petit vers*. The dialect of the manuscript is dominantly Picard, although there are numerous central French forms.

The most important difference between the *Chevalerie Vivien* of Boulogne and the other versions lies in the subject-matter. No other manuscript shows such marked divergences in this regard. A number of the variations of this manuscript appear to be the work of one *remanieur*, whose personal efforts at harmonising difficulties are visible. For example, if he places the knighting of the hero at Termes, and has

[1] We read, folio 334 verso:

Chis livres fu fais l'an de grasse
M.cc. xx fues iiii.
et xv ans tout droit sans mentir
le tierch samedi en avril.

[2] For the earliest dated manuscripts in Old French, see Carl Wahlund, *Ouvrages de Philologie Romane et d'Ancien Français*, Upsala, 1899 (tiré à cent cinquante exemplaires, et non mis dans le commerce), p. 164.

[3] *Guillaume d'Orange*, La Haye, 1854. L. Gautier expressed the opinion that the MS. of Boulogne should be taken as the basis for the publication of the poem (*Epopées Françaises*, second edition, vol. IV, p. 437). Other critics prefer MS. 1448 of the Bibliothèque Nationale as the basis for a critical edition: vid. Nordfelt, in Wahlund and Feilitzen, *Enfances Vivien*, Upsala and Paris, 1895, p. xvi, also Willy Schulz, *Das Handschriftenverhältnis des Covenant Vivien*, Halle, 1908, p. 67. MS. 1448 will, it is said, be the basis of the edition to be published shortly by A. Terracher. [Note: since the completion of these pages, the first volume of the edition mentioned has appeared. It is published by H. Champion, Paris, 1909.]

him start thence on his invasion of Spain, it is because of the well-known passage of *Aliscans*, vv. 767—72[1]. Similarly, if we find a reference to Renoart in three wretched lines[2], it is because the *remanieur* attempted, clumsily enough, to bind together by cross citations the chansons which he included in his vast compilation. The query naturally arises whether all the divergences in subject-matter may not be due to the personal labours of one *remanieur*. Again, are these divergences all simple cross-references of no special value, or do they at times preserve a knowledge of early tradition? While space is lacking for a full discussion of all these passages, a few may be passed rapidly in view. Inasmuch as few, if any, of them have been published, it will be necessary to insert them here. They will be given just as they are in the manuscript, without any attempt at alteration, except of the abbreviations.

In the opening *laisse* of the poem, Vivien makes his well-known vow never to retreat before the Saracens. His uncle tries to dissuade him. The *laisse* closes with the following lines, which are not found in any other manuscript:

Oncles Guillaumes, dist Viviens li bers,
Si m'aït Diex, jou l'ai sor sains juré
Bien a .ii. ans aconplis et passés,
Quant jou estoie en Maldrane enserrés.
La le jurai, voiant les marchans bers.
Ne puet autrement estre[3].

This passage was undoubtedly added by the *remanieur*, who had just copied the *Enfances Vivien*, and who of course remembered the oath

[1] This, the only *laisse* of *Aliscans* which is in assonance, is to be compared with vv. 2002—04 of the *Chanson de Willame*. Max Lipke, in his dissertation on the *Moniage Rainoart*, p. 80, suggests that Termes is perhaps the ancient castle, Termes-en-Termenès, near the Via Tolosana, not very far from Narbonne and Lézignan. Cf. the opinion of Joseph Bédier, *Légendes Epiques*, I, pp. 390, 391.

[2] A Saracen says of Desramé:

.I. fil a il perdu, dont molt est courechiés.
VI. ans a ja passé qu'il ne le vit des iels.
Che fu tous li mainsnés, mentir ne vous en quier.
(fol. 82 v°.)

[3] Fol. 82 r°. The hero repeats the information contained in these lines, at the moment when the attack on the enemy was about to begin. He says to his men:

Molt bonement vos soit congiés donés.
Jou remanrai, la covenanche est tes.
Quant jou estoie a Maldrane enserré,
La jurai jou, voiant les marchans bers,
Que jamais ne fuiroie por Turc ne por Esclés,
Puis que jou iere de mes armes armés.
(fol. 84 v°.)

He follows this with the statement that he made the same vow when he was armed knight. It is evident that the *remanieur* of the close of the thirteenth century regarded the vow of Vivien besieged as eminently fitting. In this, he differs from some of the modern critics: vid., for example, Wahlund and Feilitzen, *Enfances Vivien*, Upsala and Paris, 1895, p. xxxi; A. Jeanroy, in *Romania*, xxvi, p. 187.

taken in that poem by Vivien when besieged in Maldrane (vv. 2205—13). While the other manuscripts of the *Enfances* mention the oath, they call the city 'Luiserne,' instead of 'Maldrane[1].' We have here, then, a plain case where our *remanieur* or copyist carries a name from one chanson over into a following one; it should be added that the name 'Luiserne' is entirely unknown to the *Chevalerie* of Boulogne, being always represented by 'Maldrane[2].'

We now come to one of the longest independent passages (114 lines) of the *Chevalerie* in our manuscript. After what corresponds to verse 85 of the edition of Jonckbloet, the manuscript of Boulogne intercalates this long passage, which we cite entire, because of its great interest:

A Bargelonge va Viviens li ber.
La vile assist l'enfes sans arester.
Tant sist devant Vivien l'alosé
Qu'il fist a forche les grans murs craventer,
Si prist la vile, nus nel peut contrester.
Qui en Dieu ne valt croire fist Vivien decoler,
Et cil qui Dieu valt croire fist il en fons lever.
Molt fist la vile ricement atorner.
Puis prist par forche les tors de Balesgués,
Mais ne fu pas si tost com vos dire m'oés.
Ains c'ot pris ces .ii. viles, furent .iiii. ans pasés.
Et Guillaumes l'aime, sachiés voos sans fauser,
Et Guiborc la contese vit Vivien tant ber
De tot son cuer l'ama de molt grant amsté.
Viviens fu cortois et larges por doner.
Tout se tindrent a lui li jovene baceler.
Sor .i. vile ala Viviens li ber,
Tourtolouse avoit non, molt faisoit a loer.
Tant sist devant Viviens li bons ber
Que il fist toz les paiens afamer,
Dont prist la vile, on li rendi les clés.
Et Viviens fist toz crestiener.
De Porpallart oï Viviens parler,
Une chité qui siet desor la mer.
La a souvent mainte nef arrivé,
De marcheans de Cordes, la chité.
Cele part fist Viviens sa gent acheminer,
Si a assis la vile.
Viviens li preus avoit cuer de baron.
Porpallart a assis entor et environ. fol. 82 v° b.
Paien s'escrient: 'Aidiés, sire Mahon!'
Maint mal ont fait paien et esclavon.
Tant sist a Porpallart Vivien le baron
Qu'il prist la vile, si l'eut en son bandon.
Tot le dona Guillaume d'Orenge le baron.
Molt fu preus et vallans Viviens li frans hom.

[1] Vid. *Enfances Vivien*, p. xi. The statement made by the editors that, in all the other poems (save the *Enfances* of Boulogne) where the town here meant is named, it is called 'Luiserne,' is not quite correct, since the Boulogne manuscript of the *Chevalerie* calls it 'Maldrane.'

[2] Line 281 of our manuscript of the *Chevalerie*, for instance, reads: 'Pris a Maldrane et Mirados tués' (cf. vv. 126, 127 of the edition of Jonckbloet).

Il fu a Poupallart entre lui et si baron.
.Vii. ans avoit erré tot ensi com dison,
Et si avoit pris viles et marces et doignons.
Tot le dona Guillaume, qui tant estoit preudom.
A Porpallart estoit Viviens li baron.
Plus haoit Sarrasins qu'ainques ne fist nus hom.
.I. jor devers la mer regarde et si baron.
En haute mer avoit .i. dromon.
.Vii.c paiens estoient ens par non.
Marcheant furent, avoir out a fuison.
A Poupallart lor ancre jeté ont.
Et Viviens s'arma, et avoec si baron,
Si alerent encontre.

Li preus Viviens ne se valt atargier.
Il et sa gent se font tost haubergier.
Vers la nef vont u furent li paien.
Et quant paien les virent vers els aaprochier,
Effréé furent, durement che sachiés.
Li maistres va devant, cil qui miels sot plaidier,
Et Viviens les prist a araisnier:
'Dont estes vos, fait il, dites moi sans atargier?'
Li maistres respont: 'Sire, d'un estrange raisnier,
Si sommes homme Desramé au vis fier,
Le riche roi, qui tant fait a prissier,
Qui Cordes a trestot a justichier.
.Xl. rois a soz lui a baillier.
Par Mahomet, li .xv. sont si fil.
.i. fil a il perdu, dont molt est courechiés.
.Vi. ans a ja passé qu'il ne le vit des iels.
Che fu tous li mainsnés, mentir ne vos en quier.
Viviens ot de cel roi qui tant par estoit fiers.
Volentiers feroit cose dont se deüst courechier.
Ces paiens fist tous prendre sans longes atargier.
Tous .i. et .i. les a fait mahaignier. fol. 83 r°.
L'un fist colper le brach et a l'autre le pié.
L'autre a les iels crevés, l'autre a le nés trenchié.
N'i ot .i. seul paien qui ne fust mahaignié,
Fors seulement que .iiii., tant en i a d'entier.
Chaus a pris Viviens, si lor fist fianchier
Qu'il merront cele nef a ces Turs mahaignier
Tout droitement a Cordes, ou rois Desramés ert.
Dist Viviens: 'Or entendés, paien!
Vos en irés a Cordes sans point de delaier,
Si dirés vo seignor, Desramé le guerrier
Cest prosent li envoie li vassaus Viviens,
Li neveus a Guillaume d'Orenge, Brachetier.'
'Ne le ferons, biax sire, ne l'osommes laissier,'
Respondent li paien, en qui n'eut c'airier.
'Voir, dist Viviens, vos l'estuet fianchier.'
Et chiaus prisent lor dois a lor dens a touchier.
Ne plus ne mentiroit por les menbres trenchier.
Viviens fait l'avoir prendre sans atargier,
Et si l'a fait porter sus el palais plenier.
Et li paien s'entornent devers la mer arrier.
Forment crient et braient cil paien mahaignié
En haute mer siglerent dolant et courechié.
Or larai d'eus, et dirons de Vivien.
Illueques s'aparelle, il et si chevalier.
Vers Alissans vont illuec chevalchier.

La se logierent li jovene chevalier.
Paien nel porent soffir, bien le sachiés.
En fuies tornent, laissent terres et fiés.
Et Viviens ochist turs et paiens,
Quant il les pot ne prendre ne ballier.
Nus ne l'osoit atendre ne ballier.
Nus ne l'ossoit atendre, ains fuirent arrier.
De Vivien vos valdrai ore laissier.
Quant tans en ert, bien en sarons plaidier.
Del fort roi de Franche vos volrai conmenchier,
Et de le grant barnage qui fist a resoignier,
Et des .iiii. paiens qu'en mer sont courechié,
Qui portent le prosent des affolés paiens
Que Viviens envoie Desramé, le guerrier.
En cha se traie qui vielt entendre bien!
Ainc si bone canchon n'oï nus hom nonchier,
Se ne fust ceste mise, bien le pus affichier.
Or alés tost vos borses deslachier,
Et jetés cha des malles!

The events of this long passage are, as far as we know, not related in any other manuscript of the *Chevalerie*. The description of the capture and maiming of the Saracen crew is easily explainable as a natural elaboration of the *remanieur*, who is endeavouring to heighten the dramatic element of his narration[1]. Can the same be said of the detailed conquests of the young hero? Where did the *remanieur* find the hint for these conquests, or did he make them out of whole cloth? One's first thought is that he may have derived them from the text of the *Enfances*, which he had just finished copying. If, however, we examine the text of the *Enfances* in the manuscript of Boulogne, we shall find no mention of these conquests, although they are mentioned in the other manuscripts. It is hardly credible that he suppressed a passage of the original which he copied, for we see how desirous he was of establishing cross-references which would serve to bind together the contiguous poems of his compilation. He must then have drawn his account of the conquests of Vivien from some other chanson or from general tradition. It would require too much space to discuss properly the poetic history of the towns conquered by our hero[2]. Mention may be made, however, of several important facts in this connection. In a well known passage of the *Charroi de Nîmes*, the king assigns to Guillaume *Espaigne le regné*, Portpaillart and Tortolose. This is to be interpreted to mean one of two things: either songs were already in existence which sang of Guillaume's conquest or possession of these fiefs; or a poet who wrote after the *Charroi* was current composed a

[1] The other manuscripts of the *Chevalerie* describe the arrival before Desramé of the maimed Saracens, but not their capture and torture.

[2] A short discussion of this matter will be found in the *Romania*, xxxiv, p. 251 et ss.

song concerning these events. In either case, the poetic conquest of the fiefs must be accepted as an established fact. There can be no doubt that reference is made to this conquest in the vastly important lines of the *Chanson de Willame* (2509—14), where Guillaume explains to the king the circumstances that led to the death of Vivien: he, Guillaume, had, as the king knew, conquered Spain. Vivien, however, in straits, summoned him to his aid: i.e., Vivien was attacked and killed in defending the fiefs of Spain, his uncle, hastening to his rescue, was defeated in turn, losing all his men and being reduced to coming to Louis for help.

Supposing that one accepts the above statements as given, they show the conquest of the lands by Guillaume, not by his nephew, which is the point at issue. We have, however, attempted to show elsewhere[1], with reference to line 3500 of the *Willame*: 'Et tote la tere Vivien le ber,' that the lands of our young hero were precisely those of 'Spain': Portpaillart, Tortolose, with Barcelone and Balesgués. There was evidently a poem in which Guillaume left his nephew in charge of these fiefs, in whose conquest he, with other nephews, had aided. A trace of this state of affairs is to be found in MS. 1448 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, in the *Chevalerie* itself. Vivien is in danger of defeat and death. He proposes to his men that they take refuge in a castle, to await the *return* of Guillaume, Bertran and others of the family, who have gone to Orange to put their arms in good condition[2]. The same MS., in another passage, says that Guillaume may be at Barcelona, thus indicating that, as in the older part of the *Willame*[3], this city is in the possession of the Christians[4].

In addition to the above poems as possible sources from which the *remanieur* of the Boulogne *Chevalerie* may have derived his knowledge that Vivien had played a part in the conquest of Portpaillart, Tortolose, Barcelone and Balesgués, mention should be made of *Foucon de Candie*. This chanson states that Guillaume, Vivien, Bertran, Guichart and others of the family had captured from Tibaut, not alone Orange, but the above-named cities, and that, in the fighting which resulted from the capture of Tortolose, Vivien lost his life. It may be well to speak a moment concerning the testimony of *Foucon*, in view of a recent article of Professor H. Suchier[5], in which he expresses the opinion that the death scene of our young hero is not, in this poem, placed in Spain.

[1] *Romania*, XXXIV, p. 254.
[2] Fol. 208 v°.
[3] Lines 931, 932.
[4] MS. 1448, fol. 209 v°.
[5] *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXIII, pp. 41—57, especially pp. 48—52.

There is nothing in this article of Suchier to lead me to abandon my position. *Foucon* shows the following setting for the events which culminated in the death of Vivien: that Tibaut had once been in possession of Orange, Barcelona, Portpaillart, Tortolose (that is, Tortosa on the Ebro), and Balesgués (or Balesguer); that the family of Guillaume had taken these possessions from him; that he attempted an expedition of vengeance, in whose operations Barcelona and Tortosa figure (but not Orange); that in the fighting over Tortosa, Vivien met his death; that Guillaume and Guichart set out from Barcelona to betake themselves to the battle-field where Vivien fell, and from which Guillaume fled. How anyone can see in the geography of this setting a battle-field near Orange, passes comprehension. It is true that the scene of battle is called both the Archant and Aliscans, as everyone can see from Tarbé's partial edition of the poem, but this fact simply indicates a transfer from other chansons of a name which had, through error, become connected with the name of Vivien. The surprising thing would have been that *Foucon* had preserved itself free from this contamination, which poured in from many sides. Again, what the learned professor of Halle says of the use of 'Espaigne' is wide of the mark. If *Foucon de Candie* happens to apply the word 'Espaigne' to localities such as Barcelona, Balaguer, and Tortosa, it is perfectly idle to show that some writers of chansons de geste, and even a few historians of the Carolingian epoch, at times included under this name a part of southernmost France. He cites a note from the pen of Lot, who says that, to speak of Nîmes as being in 'Espaigne,' was, in a certain sense, true in the eighth and ninth centuries: 'mais depuis c'est une absurdité[1].' Furthermore, the use of the word 'Espaigne' by the author of *Foucon* is just what would be expected in a well informed writer of the latter half of the twelfth century. He shows a correct knowledge of the Rhone, of Gascony, of a number of Catalonian cities, of the Ebro, of 'la terre major,' and of the 'Ports d'Espagne.' There is no likelihood whatever of his including in 'Espaigne' a locality near Orange,—on the left bank of the Rhone at that, near Arles[2].

The traces of the war in which Vivien died that are discernible in *Foucon de Candie* indicate a poem which, in some manner, formed a pendant to the *Siège d'Orange*. A Saracen king has been dispossessed

[1] *Romania*, XXVI, p. 568, note 1.

[2] One might as well maintain that the author or authors of this poem placed Orange itself in Spain. They certainly did not do this, as the following passage shows: Guillaume, about to start from Orange for Candie, promises to release a prisoner left at Orange, on his return from Spain: 'Qu'al revenir d'Espaigne ert delivrez' (*Foucon*, MS. 25,518 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 98 r°.).

of Orange and of several Catalonian cities. He tries to recover Orange and fails (*Siège d'Orange*). In the other poem, he tries to recover the Catalonian possessions and fails. Vivien perishes in this other poem, far from Orange. There is no man alive who could read *Foucon*, having no knowledge of any related chanson, and conceive his death as taking place elsewhere than in the neighbourhood of Tortosa or Barcelona.

Professor Souchier asserts that the scene of the battle in which Vivien succumbs in the manuscripts of the *Chevalerie* is near Orange, and that this is true also of the manuscript of Boulogne. When we search for his proof, we find it resting on the plain statement that wherever *Archant* and *Aliscans* are used concurrently by a French poet, the battle-field indicated is in the vicinity of Orange. This would be a most convenient solution! Unfortunately, one cannot take these two names, the most discussed of any two names in the entire cycle of Guillaume, and solve their riddle by any such trenchant process. I have shown elsewhere[1] that these words were formerly distinct in application, and that they became confused only by a long succession of events. It is therefore clear that either of these words may have been introduced into a poem where it was originally lacking. The *Chevalerie* itself is a case in point. If we accept the opinion of the majority of the critics, the main source of this chanson is the *Willame*, where the scene of our young hero's death is called the Archant, but where the name Aliscans is entirely wanting. We may not know at what date this latter word came to graft itself upon the text, but its presence offers no justification for a rejection of the list of Catalonian conquests of Vivien according to the *Chevalerie* of Boulogne, especially when this list squares so well with the evidence of several ancient sources.

To the above considerations should be added the following general observation, which was outlined by me before the publication of the *Willame*. If Guillaume's father is said to be lord of Narbonne, it is not that the conquests of the hero, his son, should be limited to Orange and the regions nearer the centre of national power than Narbonne. Rather should we expect the scene of his exploits to be beyond the Pyrenees. In the same manner, the next generation in this family of heroes, the generation to which Vivien belonged, should carry the Christian arms still farther into Spain[2], and Foucon, Vivien's nephew,

[1] *Romania*, XXXIV, p. 237 et ss.

[2] It is interesting to see what bearing on this proposition the identification of Termes (the palace where Guillaume armed Vivien knight and whence he doubtless started upon his invasion of 'Espaigne') with Termes-en-Termenès would have. This château is situated between Lézignan and the Pyrenees. It would be a good starting-point for invaders of Spain, of whom virtually all the manuscripts say: 'Il sont entré en Espaigne la grant.'

should push on still farther into 'la terre haïe,' which is precisely what he does. As for Vivien, what more likely—more inevitable even—than that he should perish in the scene of his exploits?

It is clear from this discussion that I believe the conquests of Vivien, as given in our manuscript, to repose on a well-defined tradition. I do not mean by this that the *remanieur* necessarily, or even probably, found these geographical indications given in such detail in the written source which he copied, but rather that these indications are but the elaboration, the gloss, of a briefer and more compact statement, just as we find the words: 'Et tote la tere Vivien le ber' (*Willame*, line 3500) 'glossed' by the names 'Portpaillart,' 'Tortolose,' 'Barcelone' and 'Balesgués,' in *Aliscans*, a later form of the *Willame*. In both cases the 'gloss' is correct. Where did the *remanieur* or his near predecessor find the authority for his gloss? The *Willame* and its attendant legends would probably alone have sufficed to furnish it to him, for he would there have learned that the lands of Vivien were given to Renoart, and these lands were in Catalonia (Tortolose and Portpaillart, for example). Again, *Foucon* alone could have supplied him with the geography of Vivien's conquests and the scene of his death, by showing him that: Guillaume and his family had long been at war with Tibaut, and had taken from him Barcelona, Balesgués, Portpaillart and Orange; that just before the fatal battle in which Vivien perished, Guillaume and Guichart had marched with an army from Orange to Barcelona; that Tibaut invaded the region; that the taking of Tortolosa by Vivien was avenged by Tibaut, who slew him in battle; that Guillaume marched from Barcelona to the rescue of his nephew, but arrived too late, was defeated in turn, and fled to Orange, losing all his men. It is likely that there were other sources, unknown to us now, which confirmed the *remanieur* in regard to the Catalonian character of the expedition and death of Vivien[1].

Leaving without comment several minor passages that seem to be

[1] I have elsewhere drawn attention to a passage of the *Roland* of Châteauroux, in which a Saracen fleet sails along the coast of Persia, by the Archant and Balesguer. The fleet goes up the Ebro, and the word Archant is here in the company of names which are all Catalonian, except 'Perse.' Balaguer (or Balesgués) seems to refer to a fortress in the Col de Balaguer, toward the east of Tortosa, where passes the route from Terragona. There are a number of passages which connect Balesguer with Tortosa, and several with Archant. An interesting line concerning Balesguer and (probably) the defeat of the Archant, is to be found in *Foucon*. The Saracens have been besieging Orange, and learn that Bertran, Foucon, and other Christians have taken Candie (which is south of Catalonia). They propose to abandon the siege, and betake themselves to the deliverance of Candie. It is evident that Guillaume, the siege of Orange once raised, would follow the enemy into Spain. 'Let us go to Candie,' the besiegers say: 'Si passerons as Portz de Balesguez, Dont iert encore li quens par nos penez' (MS. 774 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 109 v°.). Defeats of Guillaume are not so numerous but that we may well see here a reference to the battle, or to some episode of the battle, of the Archant. The Saracens expect Guillaume to pursue them, and plan to overcome him *where they overcame him before*.

due to the whim of the *remanieur*, one reaches a long passage, which seems to be intercalated. The main part of this passage is devoted to the recital of an imprisoned Saracen, who has remained in the ruined castle. The Christians, in taking the old castle, have shut up with themselves a pagan: 'Et avoec aus encloent .i. paien' (line 926). The close of the intercalation describes Vivien's vain efforts to persuade Gaudin and Guielin to go for help. For reasons which will appear later, it is well to precede the intercalation with three lines that go before:

Lors se couchierent cha et la li plaié,
Et as murs vont li sain et li haitié.
Sont tot le mur de qarriaus arengié.
Et Viviens ne se volt atargier.
Devant li conmande a mangier (sic) le paien,
Qu'il prisent a l'entrer de cel castelet viés.
Et on le fist errant venir sans atargier.
Quant Viviens a veü le paien,
Si l'apela errant sans atargier:
'Paien, fait il, di, voir, ne me noier,
Qui sont cist Sarrasin dont chi a tant millier?
Or le mes nomme tost esrant san t'atargier.
Ne me fai longhe atente.'

Vivien a le paien apelé:
'Sarrasins, fait li ber, dites moi verité.
Qui sont tot cist paien qui chi sont asamblé?'
'Jel dirai, dist li Turs, volentiers et de gré,
Se sain et sauf me laissiés retorner.'
Dist Viviens: 'Oie, si m'aït Damesdeis.
Se tu me viels plevir ta loiautés
Que me diras trestot la verités.'
Dist li Turs: 'Oie, par Mahomet, mon Dei!'
Dont prent son doit a son dent l'a hurté.
Puis ne fausist por estre desmenbré.
Dont conmencha li paiens a conter.
'Sire, fait il, par Mahomet, mon dei,
Chi est venus li fors rois Desramés.
Chou est no sire, voir, et nostre avoé.
Toz ces paiens a soz lui a garder.
Et si est chi ses freres, Haucebier le dervei,
Et ses freres, Aerofles, qui molt par a fiertei,
Et sa sereur, Flehaut, qui molt a poesté.
Si sont chi xv. fil au fort roi Desramé.
Tot maintenant vous serront il nomé:
La est rois Walegrape, chou est tous li ainsnés,
Et si i est Margot, Akin, et Aenrei,
Boriaus et Agrapars et li rois Gasteblé,
Et Aiaus, Mathamar et Gondré,
Et roi Fabur, Ector et Balufré,
Et Matriblé et le roi Josué.
Icil sont fil a no seignor Desramé,
Et si sont tot riche roi coroné.
Et d'autre part a il rois a plenté.
La est, voir, de Palerne Synagon le dervé,
Et rois Mallart, Butors et Aristé,
Et rois Baldus, qui tant est redouté;

De Gadiferne est rois et avoé.
En sa terre laissa .i. sien frere maisné,
Molt estoit lais et fors, Gaidifier fu nommei. fol. 88 r°.
Chiels la est demorés por la terre garder.
Chi est rois Marinal, Orible et Cosdroé,
Danebrus et Corsubles i sont et Tempesté,
Cricados et Helbis et li rois Carbonclé,
Buchifas et Brigon et le roi Malabré,
Madun et Bucifier et le roi Baufumé,
Roi Mardus et Brihier et le roi Esmeré,
Roi Gohier et Gorhaut, Turgier et Maloré,
Et roi Gombaut de Burgine autretel,
Et rois Baudus, qui plains est de fierté.
Cil rois Baudus, je vos di par verté,
Est fiels au roi Aikin, qui est fiex Desramé.
Par Mahomet, mon dieu, que je tieng en cherté,
Icil sont trestot roi que je vos ai nommé.
Tant en i a des rois, par Mahomet, mon dé.
Li plus povres de toz puet .x. mil Turs guier.
Encore dont n'ai je mie les aumachors només,
Voir, dont il en i a assés a grant plenté.
Le pule qu'il i a ne sai jou pas nonbrer.
Mien ensiënt, bien sont .v. cent mile assamblé.'
Dist Viviens: 'Por coi sont par decha torné?'
Et dist li Turs: 'Por vostre cors tuer
Sont il venu, par Mahomet, mon dei.
N'a encore pas .iii. mois aconplis et passés,
C' a Cordes arriva .i. molt grande neif.
.Vii. c paiens a ensi atornés
Qu'il n'i eut nul qui n'eut menbre caupé,
U main ou pié, u le langue ou le neis,
Fors seul c'a .iiii., tant i eut delivrés.
Par els estoit li presens presentés.
Chou envoiastes vostre roi Desramés.
De chou fu il courechié et si fort abosmés
Que il jura sa barbe et tote sa poesté
Qu'il ne fineroit ja si vous auroit tués,
Et por itant a il sa grant ost assamblé,
Et dist qu'il destruira tote crestienté.'
Et dist Viviens: 'Paien, bien as conté.
Envers moi as bien ta foi acuité.'
Li paiens l'ot, grant joie en a mené.
Del castel est issus, ne s'est plus demoré.
Et Viviens remest o son riche barné.
Et dist Viviens: 'Franc chevalier menbré,
Avés oï ces Turs, com m'a de rois nommés.
Ne poons longement estre chi, en non Dé!'

The text then continues, somewhat as do the other manuscripts:

Li quels de vous serra ore tant osé
Qui a Orenge m'en alast, la chité,
Por le secors Guillaume le douté?
Mestier avons d'aïde.'

The resemblance to the other manuscripts is, however, only fleeting, and a considerable passage is intercalated before we return to the echo heard in lines 1043—46:

Li quens Viviens en apela Gaudin.
Ses niés estoit, par verté le vos di.
'Niés, dist Viviens, alés, je vos en pri,
Dusc' a Orenge, cele mirable chit.
Dites mon oncle Guillaume, le hardi,
Que Sarrasin nos ont apressé chi.'
'Jou n'irai mie, Gaudins li respondi.
Jou ne voel pas mon cors avoir gari.
Qui que i voist, o vos remanrai chi,
Par Dieu, le fil Marie!'

Viviens va Guielin apelant.
Chiels estoit fiex a Bernart de Braibant,
Et s'estoit freres le palasin Bertrant.
Viviens apele, et se li dist errant:
'Guielin, niés, Jhesus vos soit aidant!
De vo lignage estes del miels vallant.
Alons, biax niés! je vos pri et conmanch.
A mon chier oncle dites que je li manch
Qu'il me sekeure, car mestier en ai grant.'
Dist Guielin: 'Pas ne m'ere movant!
Ains sofferrai o vos paine et ahant.'
Viviens l'ot, si en ot ire grant
Quant ne trueve mesage.
Or fu dolans Viviens et courechié,
Quant de ses hommes n'en a .i. tant proisié
Que il eüst el mesage envoié,
Tant fort redoutent cele gent renoié.

These lines are followed by lines 950, 951, almost without change:

Lors se couchierent cha et la li plaié,
Et as murs montent li sain et li haitié.

Beginning with these lines, the text again follows that assured by the other manuscripts. It is clear that the episode of the imprisoned Saracen begins abruptly in the midst of a *laisse* in *-ié*; that this episode is followed by that of the hero's request of Gaudin and Guielin, which is unknown to the other manuscripts, that the last four lines of this latter episode commence a *laisse* in *-ié*; and, finally, that these four lines are followed by the same two lines that preceded the episode of the Saracen. We have here most of the elements of a plain intercalation. The episode especially of the imprisoned Saracen seems to be due to the caprice of probably the last *remanieur* or copyist. The episode of Gaudin and Guielin is also doubtless his work, though it was probably inspired by similar passages of the decadent epic. It differs from the episode that precedes in that it resembles closely the improvisations which jongleurs are known to have practised, namely, ringing all the changes permitted by a given situation.

Two other interruptions of the text as given in the other manuscripts concern Guichart (or Guichardin) the young brother of the hero. The first of these passages follows the line: 'Dont vers Orenge s'est Garins

(error for Girars) aroutés,' which, in nearly all the manuscripts, is the final line of the *laisse* relating Girart's escape from the castle. The passage gives the age of Guichart as eighteen, states his desire to leave Anseüne and go to Orange in order to be armed knight, describes this journey and Guillaume's promise to arm him when Vivien shall have returned from the Archant. These events occupy forty-two lines. The 'poet' then takes up again the flight of Girart, and closes the *laisse* with eleven poor lines, which simply rehash what has already been said of Girart. The *laisse* which follows is common to nearly all the manuscripts, and begins: 'Gerars fu preus et de molt grant poeste.' The second passage relates the arming of Guichart. Girart has brought the news of Vivien's predicament, and Guillaume himself consents to arm Guichart. The passage occurs in a *laisse* common to all the manuscripts, beginning: 'Li quens Guillaume ne se va atargant,' and commences after the line: 'Dist Bertrans: Oncles, tot a vostre talent.' It includes twenty-one lines. A glance at the printed edition of Jonckbloet or at any other manuscript than that of Boulogne indicates the large saving in space brought about by the two passages as here described. Aside from this economy of space, no motive is apparent for the changes made by the *remanieur* in regard to Guichart, unless it be a possible dislike for the rather romantic rôle played by Guichart in the usual version—his tender age (fifteen years), his being armed knight by his aunt, his exploit against the Saracen robbers[1]. The presentation of the young hero in the text of Boulogne is the most logical that we have in any poem, but it is, of course, far inferior to that of the *Willame* in both power and beauty.

The main differences between the version of Boulogne and that of the other manuscripts of the *Chevalerie* have now been mentioned. At first sight, our version appears to differ so notably as to constitute a separate and even a very ancient form of the poem. The longer one examines it, however, the more one becomes convinced that its variations are mainly the work of a single *remanieur* or copyist, a man who evidently thought himself above his task, but who, whatever his excellencies may have been, was no poet. His changes are marked with

[1] In what must be regarded as a minor alteration of the *remanieur* as touching Guichart, he shows good poetic judgment. In the rather successful feminine *laisse* (next to the last *laisse* of the chanson), after the ninth line according to most of the manuscripts, we read suddenly: 'A tant es vous Guichart parmi la presse.' The interpolation lasts for ten lines, and is followed by the lines: Dist Viviens: 'Por dieu, le roi poeste, Vostre merchi, racesmés moi ma sele, Par entor moi me noiés ma bouele, Puis me livrés mon ceval par le resne.' The meeting between Guichart and his brother in the interpolated verses is effective. In no other source do they meet at this tragic moment, though, as has been elsewhere observed, there is a poetic demand for such a scene.

independence, but are carried out with indifference and slovenliness. Ignorance of metre is the least of his crimes.

The *remanieur* who is responsible for most if not all of the important divergences of the manuscript of Boulogne was from Picardie. This is indicated by the language of the interpolated passages. It is true that the manuscript in general is in this dialect, but the interpolated passages, where long enough to allow a comparison, show a larger proportion of Picard traits as compared with traits of central French, than do the passages of undoubted authenticity. The poem as a whole tends of course to distinguish *-an* and *-en*. Is it by accident that the only strictly pure *laisse* in *-an* is in an interpolated passage? In this connection, it is interesting to note the treatment of the hero's name when standing in the assonance. It assonates in *-ié* in lines 210, 222 (which are both found on fol. 83 r°.), 591 (which is on fol. 85 r°.), 612 (fol. 85 v°.). In all of these cases the name is indicated by the initial letter, as is usual in the manuscript. In line 1542 the name is written in the assonance of a *laisse* in *-an*: *Viviant* (fol. 91 r°.). All of the cases where the name of the hero assonates in *-ié* are in what have here been called interpolated passages. It is likely that in no other place does the name *Vivien* assonate in *-ié*, except in certain manuscripts of the *Enfances Vivien*.

Divested of divergences which appear to be the personal work of one *remanieur*, the *Chevalerie Vivien* of Boulogne differs much less than might be supposed from the conventional form and version of the poem.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

NEW YORK.

RABELAIS AND GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERY.

III[1].

The Short Way to Cathay.

Throughout what may be called the golden age of geographical discovery the aim of every maritime explorer, whether he sailed from Bristol, or Dieppe, or Lisbon, or Seville, was to find a short way to Cathay. This was the object alike of Columbus and John Cabot, of Magellan and Gomes, of Verrazzano and Cartier. In the earlier days, when imagination was strong and knowledge vague, Cathay stood for the fabled home of the earthly Paradise. But when knowledge became more precise and Cathay was identified with China, though the more visionary spirits might still cherish dreams of terrestrial bliss, practical men were chiefly concerned to find a short route to the rich Spice Islands, a route which would save them the long voyage round the Cape of Good Hope. One such route was made known to Western Europe in 1522 when the survivors of Magellan's expedition returned to Seville with the news of the discovery of the straits which perpetuate Magellan's name. But it was believed that there were other routes, either by the North-West or the North-East, or by a northern passage through America corresponding to that discovered by Magellan in the South. It was the latter belief which found most favour in Spain. The great Conquistador, Hernán Cortés, says in his Fourth Letter to Charles V[2], which was despatched on October 15, 1524, that he proposed to explore the coast from Panuco

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. III, p. 217.

[2] *Letters of Cortes*, translated and edited by F. A. MacNutt, 2 vols., New York, 1908, II, 207.

to the coast of Florida, and from there, towards the north, as far as the Bacallaos[1]. 'For it is believed absolutely that there is a strait on that coast which leads to the South Sea.' But before the arrival of this letter Estevão Gomes, the Portuguese pilot in the service of Charles V who had so basely deserted Magellan, had already sailed from Coruña in search of the passage to Cathay in the direction indicated by Cortes. He returned in November 1525 having explored the American coast from Nova Scotia to Florida, but without having found a passage[2]. On the other hand the historian, Fernández de Ocicao, who for many years held important posts in the Spanish Indies, and who at this time was living in Hispaniola (San Domingo) wrote in his *Sumario* (printed at Toledo in 1526) in 1525 that 'if there be any such strait we that inhabit those parts do think that the same should be rather of land than of water[3].'

In the year previous to the voyage of Gomes a similar exploration with the primary object of finding a passage to Cathay had been made by the Florentine Giovanni Verrazzano on behalf of the King of France, and in most of the maps of this period, except those made at Seville, the land between Florida and Bacalhaos is called Francesca, or Nova Gallia. The results of the voyage are said to have been first recorded in a map which the explorer himself presented to Henry VIII, between his return in 1524 and the year 1526. Hakluyt speaks of it in the following terms: 'A mighty large old map in parchment, made, as it should seem, by Verazzanus, traced along the coast from Florida to Cape Bréton, with many Italian names, which layeth out the sea, making a little neck of land in 40 degrees of latitude, much like the straight neck or isthmus of Darien. It sheweth also a short and easy passage by the North-West[4].' This map is now lost[5], but it is generally regarded as the prototype of those made by Vesconte di Maggiolo at Genoa in 1527 (now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan)[6] and by Hieronimo da Verrazzano the explorer's brother in 1529 (now in the

[1] *A los Bacallaos*; at this time Bacalhaos (Portuguese for codfish) or, as it was also called, the 'New Land,' vaguely designated the region of Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador. It was not till after Cartier's first voyage that Newfoundland was known to be an island.

[2] P. Martyr, *De novo orbe*, Dec. VI, c. X (end); H. Harrisse, *Découverte et évolution cartographique de Terre Neuve et des pays circonvoisins*, Paris and London, 1900, pp. 87, 88, and *The discovery of North America*, 1892, pp. 229 ff.

[3] Eden's translation in *The first three English books on America*, ed. Arber, Birmingham, 1885.

[4] Harrisse, *Discovery*, 94, n. 1.

[5] In his dedicatory epistle to Sir P. Sidney, Hakluyt says that it was in the custody of Master Lok and Lok's map of 1582 is evidently based on it in part.

[6] Harrisse, *Discovery*, p. 553; Winsor, *History of North America*, IV, 39.

library of the Propaganda at Rome). A new feature of both these maps is that a little isthmus is shown to the East of 'Terra Florida[1],' between that country and 'Francesca,' and there is a statement on Verrazzano's map that it is only six miles across. In Maggiolo's, but not in Verrazzano's, a strait is also shown across Honduras with the legend, *Streito dubitoso*. The isthmus also appears in a series of portolans made by Battista Agnese, a Genoese cartographer who worked at Venice from 1536 to 1564. In one of these, unsigned, but dated 1536 (now at Dresden), and in four undated ones a punctuated route is even indicated with the legend *El viazo de Fransa*. Starting from a port of Normandy (doubtless Dieppe), it crosses the Atlantic, passes over the supposed isthmus, traverses the Pacific, and ends at Cathay[2]. The influence of Verrazzano is also shown in the maps which accompany Münster's *Ptolemy* of 1540 and 1545 (both printed at Basle), and the various editions of his *Cosmography*. In Map No. I, *Typus orbis universalis*, a passage is marked at the sixtieth degree of longitude between Francesca and Bacalhaos with the legend *per hoc fretum iter patet ad Moluccas*[3]. To the same Verrazzanian family belong the copper globe of Euphrosynus Ulpius (1542) now in the possession of the New York Historical Society[4] and the globe of Bailly dated 1530, the earliest extant map of demonstrably French origin[5].

Both the English and the Portuguese thought that the passage was to be found more to the north, somewhere in the direction of Labrador, or even nearer to the Pole. In 1527 a London merchant, named Robert Thorne, who had lived for a long time at Seville, expressed his views in two letters, written from that city, and addressed respectively to Henry VIII and to Dr Edward Lee, our ambassador to the Emperor[6]. It seemed to this optimist an easy matter to reach the Pole. For only about *two or three leagues* on either side of the Pole would there be any danger, and then you 'may decline to what part you list, either by the North-East route, or by the North-West, in the backe side of the new found land.'

Meanwhile an important school of cartography was being formed in France at Dieppe. It was from the Dieppe pilots, with whom

[1] Harrisse, pp. 553 and 216 ff. (with a reproduction), and see for both maps L. Hugues, *Comm. Colomb.* pt. V, Vol. II, pp. 240 f.
[2] Harrisse, *Discovery*, 626 ff.; Winsor, IV, 40.
[3] For Münster's maps see Harrisse, *Discovery*, 607 ff.
[4] Winsor, IV, 32.
[5] Harrisse, *Découverte*, 147. The inscription *Robertus de Bailly* may denote either the maker of the map or the person who ordered it.
[6] Hakluyt, II, 159 ff.

Verrazzano and his brother, living as they did at Rouen, were in close communication, that the makers of all the Verrazzanian maps, whether Frenchmen, or Germans, or Italians, got much of their information. From about 1536 onwards several remarkable specimens of the cartographic art were produced at Dieppe by Nicolas Deslien, Pierre Desceliers and others. They represent a new type of map, in which the discoveries of Jacques Cartier for the first time take their place. Cartier too had set out to find a short way to Cathay, and had failed to find a passage in the direction of Labrador. But while he was exploring the St Lawrence, a new solution of the problem presented itself to him. 'We have understood,' he says, 'of the lord Donnacona and others... that beyond the said Saguenay [the district, not the river] the said stream [the St Lawrence] floweth into two or three great lakes, and that then one finds a fresh-water sea, of which there is no mention of having seen the end, as they have heard from those of the Saguenay; for they have told us they have not been there[1].' Similarly Jean Alfonse, the experienced pilot who accompanied Roberval to Canada in 1542, says: 'The entrance of Saguenay is at 48⅓ degrees of longitude...and it seemeth to be as it were an arm of the sea, wherefore I think that this sea goes to the Pacific or in fact to the Sea of Cathay[2].' This expresses the same vague information which was given to Cartier, for the latter had been told that one way into the interior was by the river Saguenay, but that owing to the shallowness and general innavigability of the stream it presented great difficulties.

In spite of the hearsay character of the Indian chiefs' information this new theory of the passage found great favour in France, and held the field for nearly a century and a half. To find a way to China was one of the two great objects which Champlain had ever present before his eyes. The name of La Chine which La Salle gave to the royal grant of land just across the great rapids which still bear the name, about eight or nine miles from Montreal, testify to the same ambition. When he heard of the river Ohio he thought that it would prove to flow into the Pacific, and it was not till 1682 when he reached the mouth of the Mississippi, into which the Ohio falls, and found that it flowed into the Gulf of Mexico, that the dream was finally shattered.

Such briefly was the state of knowledge and speculation with regard to a passage by water through North America, to the Pacific Ocean and the continent of Asia when Rabelais began to write his Fourth Book in

[1] J. P. Baxter, *Jacques Cartier*, 1906, p. 189; Hakluyt, VIII, 246.
[2] *Cosmographie*, ed. G. Musset, 459. Hakluyt's translation is not quite accurate.

the summer of 1546. I will now cite the remarkable words in which he describes the departure of Pantagruel's fleet on its voyage of exploration:

> In good time they set sail to the Greek [northeast] wind as it got up, to which point the chief pilot had shaped their course, and set the needles of all their compasses. For his advice, and also that of Xenomanes was—seeing that the oracle of the Holy Bottle was near Cathay in Upper India—not to take the ordinary route of the Portuguese, who, sailing through the torrid zone and the Cape of Bonasperanza at the south point of Africa, beyond the equinoctial line, and losing the sight and guidance of the arctic pole, make an enormously long voyage; but to follow as near as possible, the parallel of the aforesaid India, and to turn round the said pole to the Westward, so that winding under the North they might be in the same latitude as the port of Olone without coming nearer to the pole, for fear of coming into and being shut up in the glacial Sea. And following this regular circuit by the same parallel they might have it on their right as they sailed Eastward, as on their departure it was on the left. Now this turned out to their incredible advantage; for without shipwreck, without danger or loss of men, in great calm they made the voyage to Upper India in less than four months, which the Portuguese could scarcely do in three years, with dangers innumerable.

This is from the text of the partial edition of 1548. In the complete edition of 1552 Rabelais, besides giving the name of the pilot as Jamet Brayer, substituted *canonique destour* for *regulier destour*, but this makes no difference in the meaning. Mr W. F. Smith is surely wrong in translating *l'eussent à dextre vers le Levant, qui au departement leurs estoit à senestre*, by 'they might have the eastward on their right, which at their departure was on their left.' For this rendering takes no account of the *le* before *eussent*, which must refer to the 'parallel.' On the outward voyage Pantagruel and his companions would have this imaginary parallel on their left, for they would sail to the north of it; consequently on their return by the same route they would have it on their right[1]. Here it may be noticed that the latitude of Olonne (to give it its modern spelling) is 46° 34′, while what was known in Rabelais' day as Upper India, lies roughly between latitudes 45° and 50°. Further, more or less on the same parallel will be found Cape Race, the southernmost point of Newfoundland (46° 40′), and Quebec (46° 24′).

The travellers 'set sail,' we are told, 'to the N.E. wind,' which must be taken to imply that after clearing the northernmost point of Brittany, they steered in a north-westerly direction till they reached the latitude of Olonne. For three days 'they neither sighted land nor saw anything new' (c. II). On the fourth day (according to the text of 1548) as they were 'beginning by degrees to wind round (*tournoyer*) the Pole, going further from the Equinoctial' (c. II = V of 1556 ed.) 'they met a merchant-

[1] Cf. Lefranc, pp. 322, 323.

vessel returning from Lantern-land.' This gave rise to the remarkable encounter between Panurge and the sheep-dealer, and on the next day but one, 'the west wind continuing to blow in conjunction with a little of the south-west' they came to a triangular island greatly resembling Sicily in form and situation (c. IV = IX of 1552 ed.). On leaving this island the S.W. wind was still blowing, and about sundown they disembarked on another island, that of Cheli (c. V = X of 1552 ed.). On the following day they visited the country of Procuration and passed the islands of Toku and Bohu (cc. VI, VII = cc. XII, XVI, XVII of 1552 ed.). Soon after this they encountered a terrible storm, and when it had abated, they landed at the port of the island of the Macreons. At this point the 1548 edition abruptly ends, but in the complete edition of 1552 we are told that this island was 'formerly subject to the ruler of Brittany.' On leaving the island they sailed with a gentle and delicious wind called Aguyon, which Rabelais in the *Briefer declaration* explains to be a Breton and Norman name for a sea breeze resembling the west wind on land. This surely implies that Aguyon was a westerly wind. After this there is nothing to indicate the direction of the voyagers until we come to the episode of the frozen woods, when it appears from the pilot's explanation of the phenomenon that they had reached the confines of the glacial sea (c. LVI). Finally we learn that after they had been becalmed the wind began to blow from the W.N.W.

There is just one other point in the account of the voyage that calls for notice. At the very close of the Fifth Book (in a passage which occurs in the manuscript but not in the printed text, but which is surely by Rabelais) the priestess Bacbuc after presenting Pantagruel and his friends with three bottles filled with water, tells them that the rarefaction of the water by heat will produce air, and that by means of this air the ships will be carried direct, without touching land if they please, to the port of Olonne. But why to Olonne instead of to St Malo, the port from which they had sailed? For the same reason no doubt that Olonne is mentioned at the outset of the voyage, because it was on the same parallel as the Oracle of the Bottle.

Such are, so to speak, the geographical data of Pantagruel's voyage. The following question now arises: What route had Rabelais in mind when he wrote the passage at the close of the first chapter of the Fourth Book which I have quoted above? Did he from the beginning contemplate a voyage by the North-West passage? Or was he thinking of a passage further to the south by way of the St Lawrence? If the

passage stood alone, if we had no other indications of the direction taken by the voyagers, I should unhesitatingly choose the latter alternative. For firstly from the time of Cartier the idea of a passage by the St Lawrence was 'as we have seen' the prevailing one in France, and, secondly, the account of Cartier's voyages, as I hope I have shown in my preceding paper, had a decided influence upon Rabelais's narrative. But other indications in the narrative, the mention of south-westerly winds—in Rabelais's day the coast of Labrador was supposed to trend to the north-east—and of the approach to the confines of the glacial sea, are in favour of the view which has been so admirably explained and illustrated by M. Lefranc, namely that Pantagruel is represented by Rabelais as reaching the continent of Asia by what is known as the North-West passage.

In my book on Rabelais I suggested that when he wrote the first chapter of the Fourth Book at Metz in 1547, he was thinking of the supposed passage by way of the St Lawrence, but that later he adopted the idea of a voyage by the North-West passage. I further suggested that this change was due to Cartier's failure to find a passage in the direction of the St Lawrence. I now see that this latter hypothesis is clearly untenable. So far as we can gather, both Cartier and Jean Alfonse returned with the conviction that the passage to Cathay, though they had been unable to find it, was to be sought rather in the neighbourhood of the St Lawrence and the Saguenay than in the direction of Labrador.

There are some difficulties too in the way of my first hypothesis. If Rabelais abandoned the idea of a passage by way of the St Lawrence, why in the Fifth Book does he again mention the port of Olonne? Moreover there is some inconsistency in his narrative of the outward voyage. In chap. I he says that the chief pilot and Xenomanes advised them to keep in the same latitude as the port of Olonne, *without coming nearer to the Pole.* But in chap. V (ed. 1552) he tells us that they were beginning by degrees to wind round the Pole, *going further from the Equinoctial.* This looks as if when he wrote this last passage he had begun to change his mind. I have said elsewhere, following a suggestion of Mr W. F. Smith, that in all probability that portion of the Fourth Book which appeared in 1548 was written in two sections, the first, consisting of chapters I, V—VIII, XVIII—XX (ed. 1552), at Metz in 1546, and the second, consisting of IX—XI, part of XII, XVI, XVII, XXI—XXIV, and a part of XXV, at Paris in 1547. Thus according to this division of the chapters, which however must be

regarded as purely provisional, the idea of a North-West passage had already suggested itself to Rabelais at Metz.

Hitherto in this and the previous papers I have confined myself mainly to a consideration of Rabelais's literary sources for geographical matters. But one may suppose that he also consulted maps, and, if so, what maps?

First, one naturally thinks of the maps which accompany the *Novus Orbis*. Now in some of the copies of the Basle editions of 1532 and 1537, the former of which was certainly used by Rabelais, there is a map which is generally attributed to Sebastian Münster, chiefly, if not wholly, on the ground that he wrote the geographical summary which serves as an introduction to the volume. But the map bears no resemblance to his undoubted work in the *Ptolemy* of 1540 and 1545. It belongs to an early type in which North America is only represented by two islands, Cuba and Terra Corterealis, and in fact closely resembles Schöner's globe of 1515. As it is only found in some of the copies of the *Novus Orbis*, it is very probable that it does not really belong to it, but was sometimes bound up with it[1]. Rabelais certainly did not use it. Nor did he use the map which Oronce Finé made in 1531, and which is found in most copies of the Paris 1532 edition of the *Novus Orbis*. This belongs to a type prevalent in Germany between 1523 and 1538, in which America is joined to Asia[2].

A very popular map was the one made by the great Gerard Mercator at Louvain, in 1538, in which he reverted to the older and correct view of the separation of America from Asia, making a *fretum arcticum* between the *baccalearum regio* and the Arctic lands[3]. With the exception of this indication of a passage, there is nothing in the map to suggest that it was known to Rabelais.

Then there are the maps already referred to which Sebastian Münster published at Basle in his *Ptolemy* of 1540 and 1545 and his *Cosmographia* of 1541, 1550, etc., of which those which concern us are *Typus orbis universalis* (I) and *Novae insulae* (XVII). In these too America is separated from Asia, and in No. I a passage is marked between 'Francesca' and 'Terra Nova sive de Bacalhos,' with the legend, *per hoc fretum iter patet ad Molucas*. Newfoundland appears as one small island, with the name of Corterati. On the continent of Asia *India*

[1] It is reproduced in Nordenskiöld's *Facsimile Atlas to the early study of Cartography*, Stockholm, 1889, Plate XLII.

[2] Nordenskiöld, XLI (2).

[3] Nordenskiöld, Plate XLIII. In 1541 Mercator made a globe which is now in the royal library at Brussels. The gores for it have been reproduced at Brussels, 1875.

superior is marked between 60° and 70°, that is to say, on the same latitude as the passage. In the map of the *Novae insulae* we find the following legends: *Parias abundat auro et margaritis, Canibali' Regio Gigantum, 7 insulae Margueritarum.* All this is more or less in conformity with Rabelais's ideas about the New World, and M. Lefranc has rightly included these two maps among the illustrations to his book[1].

Finally we come to the maps of the Dieppe school, three of which, at least, were in existence when Rabelais began to write his Fourth Book, namely, (1) a map in the Harleian collection of the British Museum[2], (2) a map made by Nicolas Deslien in 1541, now in the Royal Library at Dresden, and (3) a 'boke of Idrography' or atlas, made by John Rotz, a citizen of Dieppe, in 1542 for Henry VIII[3]. A fourth map of the same school was made by Pierre Desceliers in the very year, 1546, that Rabelais began his account of Pantagruel's voyage. This is the so-called 'Map of Henri II[4].' All these maps give the results of Cartier's discoveries, but there is no proof that Rabelais was acquainted with any of them. None of them indicate any passage by way of the St Lawrence. Indeed in the Harleian map the course of the St Lawrence, after being traced for some distance beyond *Le premier sault* and the junction of another river, which is apparently meant for the Ottawa, is abruptly barred by a large undiscovered tract of country. The only one which shows any indication that it may possibly have inspired some parts of Rabelais's narrative is the 'Map of Henri II.' On this we find marked not only a Terre des Bretons and the island of Cape Breton, but to the south-east of this in latitude 46° an island called Isle du breton, which perhaps may have suggested to Rabelais his Isle des Macréons. For that island is said to have been formerly subject to the *dominateur de Bretaigne*[5]. Then, as I pointed out in a former paper[6], we find in the gulf of St Lawrence the Isle aux Margaulx, which recalls the *clergaulx*, etc., of the Ringing Island, and almost due east of

[1] p. 32, and at the end of the book.

[2] Add. MSS. 5413. The official date is 1536, on the ground that the arms of the Dauphin show an open crown, and that the crown was closed in that year. Was this the case? Prof. Beazley assigns it to 1536—1540. It must certainly have been made after Cartier's return from his second voyage in July, 1536. M. Harrisse says it must be later than his third voyage from which he returned in October, 1542. But it gives no information which goes beyond the results of the second voyage, except the name San Malo.

[3] MSS. royal 20 E ix; see esp. leaf 24; Harrisse, *Découverte*, 201, 220.

[4] Reproduced by M. Jomard in *Monuments de la géographie.* Paris, 1858—1862. It was at that time in his possession; it is now in Lord Crawford's library. R. H. Major deciphered on it in faint writing the words, 'Faicte a Arques par Pierre Desceliers presbr. 1546.'

[5] Some commentators take Bretaigne to mean Britain; this seems unlikely.

[6] *M. L. R.* III, 217.

Cape Race the Isle of St Brandan. South-east of the Isle du breton between latitudes 37° and 41° numerous islands are marked, and south of the Bermudas is an island called *La Catholique*, which is vaguely suggestive of the famous Isle des Papimanes. Among the pictures which diversify the surface of this interesting map two are especially noteworthy. One is a small full-length figure with the legend of M. de Roberval and the other represents the harpooning of a whale. I give these comparisons for what they are worth, which is not perhaps much. For not one of them points to the map conclusively as the source of Rabelais's inspiration. But, taken as a whole, they are suggestive, and it must be remembered that even supposing that Rabelais had studied the map, we must not look for too close a resemblance. He was, after all, not a scientific geographer, but a writer of romance, bound only by his own imagination.

In any case there is nothing that I have been able to find in this or any other map which throws light on Rabelais's views as to the short way to Cathay. The only conclusion to which the evidence seems to point is that his first idea was to conduct his travellers by way of the St Lawrence, and that for some reason or other afterwards he abandoned this for a more northerly route, that of the North-West passage. When Captain Roald Amundsen accomplished his remarkable voyage from the Atlantic to the Pacific, he realised the dream of nearly five centuries. But it was not a '*short* way to the East by the West,' for it took three years to accomplish.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

SHORT STORIES AND ANECDOTES IN SPANISH PLAYS[1].

II.

(xx)

Un pintor hizo el retrato
de un gato; y porque supiese
de quien era el que le viese,
puso abajo: 'Aqueste es gato.'

Calderón, *La devoción de la cruz*, III, 3.

Jiménez (p. 67) quotes a parallel story (*conejo*) from Pacheco[2]. The following version occurs in *Don Quixote* (II, LXXI):

Este pintor es como Orbaneja, un pintor que estaba en Ubeda, que cuando le preguntaban qué pintaba, respondía: Lo que saliere; y si por ventura pintaba un gallo, escribía debajo: *este es gallo*, porque no pensasen que era zorra.

(xxi)

El perro sabio de Olias
por hallarse en doble boda
fué á Cabañas con gran prisa,
y en llegando habían comido;
volvióse para su villa,
y habían comido también;
con que se quedó *per istam*.

Calderón, *Mañana será otro día*, II, 22[3].

This apologue, of oriental origin (Chauvin, III, 110), probably gave rise to the proverbial expression 'perro de muchas bodas,' and explains an otherwise difficult passage in Mira de Amescua's *El Esclavo del Demonio* (ed. 1905, ll. 1056–8):

Señor, no tenemos nada;
la boda del perro ha sido
esta boda.

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV (January 1909), p. 184.
[2] Quoted, likewise, in *El Belianís literario*, 1765, p. 162.
[3] Dr G. T. Northup informs me that this apologue occurs in the *Selva confusa*, a play of doubtful authorship.

(XXII) Tirso de Molina, in *La huerta de Juan Fernández* (I, 3), tells the beautiful story of Partinuplés de Bles, which was so popular in the Peninsula[1].

(XXIII) Lope, in *Llegar en ocasión* (P. VI, 205 v°.), relates how a Neapolitan complained to his father-in-law of his shrewish wife. He was assured that she would mend in time; her mother had been the same. This well-known anecdote is found in Domenichi's *Facetie...* (ed. 1574, p. 23; told of a peasant) and in the *Scelta di facezie, tratti, buffonerie...* (Firenze, 1586, p. 131; likewise related of a peasant)[2].

(XXIV) A poor hidalgo, on going to bed, found six thieves in his room, whereupon he said to them:

> de noche andays a buscar
> lo que yo no hallé de dia.
> Lope, *La prueba de los ingenios* (P. IX, 15 v°.).

Parallels will be found in Lee's study on *Merry Tales... Notes and Queries*, 1903, 364, and in Stiefel's, *Anglia*, 1908, 493–4.

(XXV) Of the husband who looked up-stream for his contrary wife, who had been drowned. Lope, *Selvas y bosques de amor* (P. IX, 30). To the bibliography given in *M. L. N.*, XXI, 169, may be added: *Scelta di facezie*, 134, *La selva confusa*, Stiefel, *Anglia*, 1908, 484, Boira, *El libro de los cuentos*, I, 19, etc.

(XXVI) A lady had an orchard, and in it a fine pear tree; but she did not care for pears, *ni preñada ni parida*. She sold the orchard, and then, when the pears no longer belonged to her, she began to crave for them, and finally became so fond of pears that she had them at every meal. Tirso, *El Pretendiente al reves* (VIII, 152).

(XXVII) In a certain realm he was king who bore the heaviest burden on his back. On one occasion the people assembled to elect a king. One man presented himself carrying an ebony tree, and the kingdom was almost in his possession when another man appeared bearing on his back a woman. The assembled people made him king. Tirso, *El Caballero de Gracia*, I, IX. Part of the motive occurs in Italian collections of anecdotes in the following form:

> Essendo leuata burasca in mare, tutti coloro, che erano in naue, hebbero commandamento di gettare in mare tutte le cose piu graui. E tra gli altri uno

[1] See *M. L. N.*, XXI, 3–8. The direct source of Lope's *La viuda valenciana* is more probably Bandello (IV, XXVI) as noted by Schaeffer (I, 153).

[2] This rare *Scelta* contains three anecdotes (pp. 169, 139, 57) found in Sebastian Mey's *Fabulario* (ed. *M. L. N.*, XXI, pp. 169, 201, III [the source was probably Domenichi, p. 430], XIV, XV). A modern version of XV is published in R. Boira's *El libro de los cuentos* (1862, III, 210).

ui fu, che per la prima ui trasse la moglie, dicendo: che non haueua altra cosa piu graue, nè che piu gli pesasse di lei. Domenichi, p. 57.

This same version is found in Guicciardini, *Detti e fatti*...1598, p. 186, *Scelta di facezie*...p. 123.

(XXVIII) A gentleman one day congratulated a lady on the marriage she was about to contract. 'Why,' she replied, smiling, 'do you congratulate me?—because I am losing a friend?' Calderón, *El acaso y el error*, ed. Hartzenbusch, II, 6 c.

(XXIX) When I was a boy my mother used to tell me that the devil wished to try whether he could create men like those made by God—and they turned out to be monkeys. Tirso, *Siempre ayuda la verdad* (ed. 1906, 218).

(XXX) A hangman was teaching his profession to an apprentice, and seeing that the latter could not learn, he advised him to study to become a doctor. Tirso, *El amor médico*, I, 1.

(XXXI) A man had an abscess in his side. His doctor, thinking he had dropsy, made a prescription, and as he was signing it, a mule kicked the patient, and the abscess broke. Whereupon he said to the doctor: 'In the matter of abscesses, the mule makes a better diagnosis than you.' *Ibid.*

(XXXII) A gentleman of means used to get up from his bed in the cold of winter, and walk about in his shift, in order that he might the better appreciate the warmth of his bed. Tirso, *La fingida Arcadia*, I, 2. This anecdote reminds one that Montaigne was wont to have himself disturbed in his sleep, in order that he might enjoy it the more.

(XXXIII) The subjects of a king, who was lame, imitated him in order that they might flatter him. Tirso, *ibid.*, II, 1. In *El amor médico* (VIII, 266), Tirso tells a somewhat similar anecdote of a *cacique* who had lost a tooth.

(XXXIV) A peasant, who believed that a poet spoke truly when he called the teeth of court-ladies pearls, sold his estate and became a dentist. Tirso, *Quien no cae no se levanta*, I, 4.

(XXXV) An abbot, who was travelling, came to a ford. 'Be careful,' said a shepherd to him, 'for yesterday a traveller was drowned because he missed the ford.' The abbot then asked how far it was to the bridge. 'Two leagues and a half' replied the shepherd. Whereupon the abbot remarked, 'If he who was drowned yesterday had gone by the bridge, he would have crossed the bridge by this time. The dry bridge for me!' Moreto, *No puede ser*, I. This is

very similar to a story told in the *Disciplina* of Peter Alphonsus, reproduced in Climente Sanchez's *Exemplos* (Chauvin, IX, 27).

(XXXVI) A Portuguese challenged an opponent and designated for the duel a remote place in a mountain; 'in order that he might have less to do.' Moreto, *El Caballero*, II, 1.

(XXXVII) A girl who became sick from eating ashes, for which she had an unnatural craving, was cured by a doctor who prescribed them for her; whereupon she lost her appetite for them. Moreto, *Yo por vos...* I, 2[1].

(XXXVIII) A Castillian received a letter, and went from Madrid to Seville, in the depth of winter, saying to the one who had written to him: 'I have come here in order not to weary you [with a letter].' Lope, *El príncipe perfecto*, ed. Rivad., IV, 127. This is different from the story told by Domenichi (36), of the man who delivered his own letter.

(XXXIX) A captain, who was besieging a city, declined water that had been brought from within the city walls, saying, 'I do not drink water that has cost such illustrious blood.' *Ibid.*, 130.

(XL) In a Castillian garden there was a statue of Caesar. A page one day addressed it, and said: 'Caesar, *albricias*, if you desire the laurel of ancient monarchy, for to-day you shall again reign in Rome.' And, lo! the statue began to smile. Then the page said: 'Why art thou smiling, with such cold hopes? Octavius is king, proud Caesar.' And the statue returned to its former state. *Ibid.*, 97.

(XLI) The story of the absent-minded poet who tied his mule to

[1] This anecdote, like others in this article, has been republished in Boira's *El libro de los cuentos*, II, 199. As almost all Boira's stories in verse are taken from the drama, the following version of the Orpheus *romance* may be noted (I, 210):

Al infierno el Tracio Orfeo
Su mujer bajó á buscar,
No pudo á peor lugar
Llevarle tan mal deseo.
Cantó, y al mayor tormento
Puso suspension y espanto,
Mas que lo dulce del canto
La novedad del intento.
El triste dios, ofendido
De tan estraño rigor,
La pena que halló mayor,
Fue volverlo á ser marido.
Y aunque su mujer le dió
Por pena de su pecado,
Por premio de lo cantado
Perderla facilitó.

For other versions see *M. L. N.*, XX, 116, *B. H.* 1906, 392, *Z. R. Ph.*, XXIII, 447. See, also, *Memorial histórico* (Real Academia de la Historia), XII, 125–7; Lope de Vega (ed. Rivad.) III, 542 c, IV, 334 c, 346 c, 418 c.

the manger, but forgot to remove the bridle. The mule thereupon kicked the poet, who was later found in the manure, invoking the Muses. Lope, *La inocente sangre*, ed. Rivad., IV, 358, *El castigo del discreto*, P. VII, 37.

(XLII)

Otra vez, dicen que estaba
Cierta batalla pintando
De un Príncipe y de un gigante
Con una maza en la mano,
Y tomando el orinal
(Porque siempre los letrados
Le tienen en los estudios),
Dió nueva fuente al Parnaso.
Y estando así, divirtióse
En el golpe y alzó el brazo;
Y pensando que era maza
El orinal desdichado,
Dió en la mesa que escribía
Sobre el papel tal porrazo,
Diciendo: '¡Muera el traidor!'
Que acudiendo los criados,
Mesa, libros y papeles
Llenos de orines hallaron.

Lope, *La inocente sangre*, ed. Rivad., IV, 358 b.

A shorter version occurs in the same author's *Quien ama no haga fieros*, I, 436.

(XLIII) A wealthy *cacique* would wear spectacles. He bought a pair for a thousand pesos, but being unable to see with them, was given a pair without glasses, whereupon he naively declared that he now could see everywhere. Lope, *El guante de Doña Blanca*, ed. Rivad., III, 31 c.

(XLIV)

Tengo un vecino, Señor,
Que es atambor de tu guarda,
Y en hablando su mujer,
Toca á rebato la caja.
Pero como viese un dia
Que la caja no bastaba,
Hízola con los palotes
Caja, y calló tres semanas.

Ibid., 33 b.

(XLV)

Halló un marido ofendido
Con su mujer acostado
Un galan, tan descuidado
Como si fuera el marido.
Era el caso á mediodia,
Y el galan, con el temor
De la espada y del rigor
Con que el marido venia,
Sola la camisa puesta,
Salió á la calle, y corriendo,
Iba á la gente diciendo:

'¡Fuera! que va sobre apuesta.'
Desviábase la gente
Hasta que el galan llegó
A su casa, en que ganó
La apuesta por diligente.

Ibid., 26.

(XLVI) The servant of an astrologer in Valladolid made true prognostications by writing the opposite of his master. When the astrologer died, the servant made no more, because, as he said, he could predict only by contradicting his master. Lope, *El ausente en el lugar*, II, 11.

(XLVII)

César llamaron, Señor,
A aquel duque que traía
Escrito por gran blason:
'César ó nada'; y en fin
Tuvo tan contrario el fin,
Que al fin de su pretension
Escribio una pluma airada:
'Cesar ó nada, dijiste,
Y todo, César, lo fuiste,
Pues fuiste César y nada.'

Lope, *El perro del hortelano*, II, 5.

(XLVIII) A woman of quality became enamoured of a servant and begged of him his shoes, hose and so forth. When a friend remonstrated with her, she replied: 'How can he love me if what he gives me costs him nothing? A thing is appreciated according to its cost.' Lope, *La llave de la honra*, ed. Rivad., II, 118 b.

(XLIX) A foreigner, who had become intoxicated, was left at the Puerta de Alcalá (Madrid). By mistake he entered the wrong coach and was taken to Alcalá. Being penniless, he had to pledge his clothes and arms, and then walk back to Madrid, 'A pié, desnudo, sin cuello.' Lope, *El desprecio agradecido*, ed. Rivad., II, 253 c.

(L) A sexagenarian married. He was sans teeth, except one, which looked like a hermitage in that desolate waste. One day, in a sudden encounter with his wife, the solitary tooth got into her mouth. 'Take it,' she said to him, 'for I have a dozen of them.' Lope, *Los peligros de la ausencia*, ed. Rivad., II, 411 c.

(LI) An artist painted thirteen apostles in a picture of the Lord's supper. When payment was refused him because of the error, he exclaimed: 'Take it, for this fellow, after he has had supper will go away.' Lope, *Amar sin saber á quien*, III, 1. This anecdote, which occurs in many Italian collections, is found in Timoneda's *El Sobremesa y Alivio de Caminantes*, ed. Rivad., III, 180, No. XLII.

(LII) The following story illustrates the proverbial expression, 'it all depends whose bull is gored':

Desde una reja miraba
Un canonigo en Toledo
Una mula que, sin miedo,
De una peña en otra daba,
Para despeñarse al río.
Dábanse priesa á salir,
Y él, sin cesar de reír,
Daba en aquel desvarío
Hasta verla despeñar;
Pero viendo como un rayo
Ir tras ella su lacayo,
Volvió el placer en pesar,
Sabiendo que era la suya.

Lope, *La Esclava de su galán*, III, 23.

(LIII)

Preguntóle un caminante
A un labrador qué llevaba
En una carga; y él dijo,
Previniendo la desgracia:
'Yo, nada, si cae el jumento';
Que era de vidrios la carga.

Lope, ¡*Si no vieran las mujeres*! ed. Rivad., II, 583 b.

Mira de Amescua's version is:

Llevava un hombre una carga
de vidrios para vender:
preguntándole otro, ¿qué trae
en essa carga, mancebo?
èl le respondió, '¿qué lleuo?
nada si el asno se cae.'

El rico avariento, P. IX, 137–8.

(LIV)

Después de luchas mortales
Bartolote se casó
con Casilda, que parió
á seis meses no cabales.
Y andaba con gran placer
diciendo: '¡Si tu la vieses!
Lo que otra hace en nueve meses,
hace en cinco mi mujer.'

Calderón, *La devoción de la cruz*, II, 7.

(LV) A peasant did not know what to do with a rope, a stake, a goat, an onion, a chicken and an olla. Calderón, *Peor está que estaba*, I, 3.

(LVI)

Escriben los naturales
Que puesto un borrico en medio
De dos piensos de cebada,
Se deja morir primero
Que haga del uno elección
Por mas que los mire hambriento.

Calderón, *Guárdate del agua mansa*, II, 4.

(LVII) An innkeeper's wife made chickens tender by burning their feet, while still alive. A guest who saw this, applied the same method to the legs of his hard bed. Calderón, *No siempre lo peor es cierto*, II, 13.

(LVIII) A poor painter showed a room to his friend, and told him that he would whitewash it and then paint it. His friend suggested that he paint it first and then whitewash it. Calderón, *Los dos amantes del cielo*, I, 3. This well-known anecdote occurs in the *Cuentos recogidos por D. Juan de Arguijo*, ed. Paz y Melia, in *Sales Españolas*, II, 100.

(LIX) A captive with a twang (*gangoso*) pretended to be mute and was ransomed for a small sum of money. Later he declared that he could speak; whereupon his captor remarked that if he had spoken sooner he would have been ransomed for less. *Ibid.*, II, 7.

(LX) At a luncheon, a guest was given cold chicken, but warm wine. He put the chicken into the wine, in order to warm the one or to cool the other. Calderón, *El médico de su honra.*

(LXI) Because a storm was threatening, a traveller was asked to remain at the home of a friend. He refused, but later changed his mind and returned, confessing that he had changed his mind. But his friend had not repented, and so refused to open the door. Alarcón, *Quien engaña más á quien*, I, 2. Cf. Domenichi, 68—9, *Scelta di facezie*, 135.

(LXII)

Conuidó un ombre á comer
A un amigo que tenía,
Y por el calor que hazía,
Mandó la mesa poner
Junto á la noria de un guerto:
La muger del qual, zelosa,
Andaua tan desdeñosa
Y de humor tan rostrituerto,
Que el colerico marido,
De ver que á su conuidado
Le mostrase tanto enfado,
Desesperado y corrido,
Con manos y ojos crueles,
Aunque el guesped le aplacó,
Dentro de la noria echó
La comida y los manteles.
El conuidado, la historia
Viendo, sin mostrar desdén,
Cogió el bufete y tanbién
Le echó dentro de la noria.
¿Qué hazeys? le dixo enojado
El guesped, ¿estays en vos?
Perdonad, señor, por Dios,
Le respondió el conuidado,

Que entendí, viendo os hazer
Tal nouedad de agasajo,
Que por mas fresco, allá bajo
Nos ybamos á comer.

Lope, *Sin secreto no ay amor*, ed. Rennert ll. 1595–1621.

(LXIII) The wives of the Roman senators boast that they are the strongest in the world: Rome is mistress of the world; its senators rule Rome; the senators are ruled by their wives. Lope, *La llaue de la honra*. For such cumulative stories see Chauvin, II, 98, 230 n. (Lope gives 'Zorobabel' as source in ed. Acad., VI, LXXXVII ff.); Coelho, *Contos populares*, 23—4; Clouston, *Popular tales*, I, 289 ff.; *Cento novelle*, LXIX (wife of Hercules strongest, because she subdued Hercules).

(LXIV)

Iba un fraile devoto caballero,
Y cuando tanta espuela le metía
A la mula, decia:
'Arre por caridad, hermana mula.'

Lope, *Las bizarrías de Belisa*, ed. Rivad., II, 564.

(LXV)

En un convento en mi tierra
cantaban, como otras veces,
los Maytines en el coro,
y estaban, que ansí los leen,
unos tras otros diez Frayles:
durmióse el primero, y este
dió con el cuerpo al segundo;
y como estaban enfrente,
de frayle en frayle cayeron
todos diez, como acontece
quando juegan á los bolos.

Lope, *La mayor virtud de un rey*, ed. 1777, 160.

(LXVI) A criminal bribes a hangman in order that he shall be whipped less severely; but the blows inflicted upon him are all the more cruel. Calderón, *El alcaide de sí mismo*, I, 11. Cf. *Cuentos recogidos por D. Juan de Arguijo*, ed. Paz y Melia, II, 145.

(LXVII) When soldiers were being billeted among villagers, one asked for two, in order that his joy might be the greater when they left. Calderón, *El pintor de su deshonra*, I, 3.

(LXVIII)

Sordo un hombre amaneció,
y viendo que nada oía
de cuanto hablaban, decía:
'¿Qué diablos obligó
á hablar hoy de aquesos modos?'
Volvían á hablarle bien,
y él decía: '¡Hay tal! ¡que dén
hoy en hablar quedo todos!'

Calderón, *El pintor de su deshonra*, II, 2.

(LXIX) Of the wife who thought all men had bad breath. Lope, *La prueba de los ingenios*, P. IX, 9vo. Climente Sanchez (CCCXII) gives St Jerome as the source. See also Landau, *Die Quellen des Dekameron*, p. 81.

(LXX)

Vn cuento viejo y grosero
que ha dos mil años que anda
me haze decir la ocasion,
porque es propio y semejante.
Tenía vn viejo estudiante,
a tu traza y condición,
vn hidalgo en Salamanca,
y escrivióle que comiesse
lo más barato que huuiesse
en aquella plaça franca.
Preguntava qué valía
vna vaca á sus criados,
y como veinte ducados,
el comprador respondía:
replicava, y dos perdizes?
quatro reales; pues comer
perdizes y obedecer.

Lope, *El sembrar en buena tierra*, P. X, 183.
Timoneda, *Sobremesa*...ed. Rivad., II, XL.

(LXXI)

Condesa.

¿Hay remedio para ver
Si los hijos de un celoso
Son suyos?

Durango.

Díjome ayer
Un hombre un cuento donoso,
Con que se puede saber.

Condesa.

¿Cómo?

Durango.

Un cierto labrador,
Cuya mujer que paría,
Nunca estaba sin amor,
De sus hijuelos tenía,
Que no eran suyos, temor;
Y queriendo averiguar
Si era cierta en el lugar
De su mujer la opinion,
Halló una cierta invención.

Condesa.

¿Cómo?

Durango.

Mandóse castrar;
Porque con esto pensaba
Que si su mujer paría,
Sabría si le engañaba.

Lope, *Las flores de Don Juan*, ed. Rivad., I, 422 c.
See *Facetiae* of Poggio, CCXXV.

(LXXII) A husband drowned his wife by placing her upon a mule that had not drunk water for three days, and which, when led to a stream, plunged into it frantically. Lope, *El Príncipe perfeto*, ed. Rivad., IV, 135 b.

(LXXIII)

¡ Oh qué cuento te diré
De un corro de ciertas sotas !
Que estando en risa y chacotas
(La casa yo me la sé),
Cierto parche se cayó ;
Y sobre cuál le traía
Hubo tal grita y porfía...
'—Vos le trajistes.—Yo no.—
Yo estoy como una manzana.—
Yo limpia como un cristal.—
Marcia le trajo.—No hay tal ;
Que dió á los pies de Diana.'
—Que como cuatro garduñas,
Con las garras de dos varas
Se hicieron quesos las caras,
Y vivos rallos las uñas.

Lope, *Santiago el verde*, I, 18.

(LXXIV)

No te acuerdas
de un cuentecillo de Esopo,
que no pudiendo la fuerza
del demonio derribar
una casada tan bella
como honesta, que adoraba
á su esposo, por postrera
diligencia, para el caso
se fué en casa de una vieja.
Y con la promesa sola
de unos zapatos sin medias,
puso, en lo que fué imposible
para el demonio, tan nuevas
diligencias, que salió
en dos días con la empresa,
y pidiéndole al diablo,
que la manda le cumpliera,
le puso el par de zapatos,
por no tenerla tan cerca,
en un varal, que hasta el mismo
Satanas tiembla á una vieja.

Vélez de Guevara, *El Hércules de ocaño*, ed. Schaeffer, p. 224.

For the extensive literature on this story see Oesterley, *Kirchhofs Wendunmuth*, V, 60 (1869), Stiefel, *Germania*, 1891, Prato, ZVV., 1889, 189.

Many short stories in the Spanish drama occur in Greek and Latin classics, and had been made popular by Valerius Maximus, Plutarch, and humanists like Erasmus. A few may be noted here: (LXXV) A philosopher taught for a small fee pupils who had never studied; but those who had studied were obliged to pay a double fee, one for teaching

them to unlearn, the other for teaching them to learn. Tirso, *El pretendiente al revés*, II, 6. (LXXVI) Octavian and the shepherd who resembled him. Tirso, *La ventura con el nombre*, I, 2. (LXXVII) What Cicero said when he heard someone whispering while Gallus was acting. Lope, *Lo que ha de ser*, ed. Rivad., II, 509 b. (LXXVIII) The complaint of the treble string of a *vihuela* to Apollo. Lope, *Santiago el verde*, ed. Rivad., II, 208 b. (LXXIX) Caesar's (variant Augustus') reproof to Julia for wearing unseemly attire. Lope, *El príncipe perfeto*, ed. Rivad., IV, 118, and *La batalla del honor*, P. VI, 20. (LXXX) Crisipus resigned his office, because if he served badly, he would displease the gods; if well, he would displease men. *Ibid.* 134 c. (LXXXI) Of the pumpkin which, according to Murrius, became a poet. Lope, *La inocente sangre*, ed. Rivad., IV, 358. (LXXXII) What Leontiquidas said when he was shown a marvel, in the form of a serpent coiled about a key: 'Athemius, it would be a marvel if the key were coiled about the serpent.' Lope, *El guante de Doña Blanca*, ed. Rivad., III, 28. This is somewhat like Dana's definition of news: 'If you go into the street and see a dog bite a man, that is not news. But if you see a man bite a dog, that is news.' (LXXXIII) Philip of Macedon passed judgment upon two criminals, and in order that the punishment might be equal, he sentenced the one to leave Greece—and the other?—to run after him. Lope, *Servir á señor discreto*, ed. Rivad., IV, 85 b. (LXXXIV) Leonidas' reply on being asked why he chose so small a wife. Lope, *Santiago el Verde*, ed. Rivad., II, 198 c. The anecdote is also told of Aristotle (cf. Kirchhof's *Wendunmuth*, ed. Stutt. Ver., Vol. 99, p. 99). (LXXXV) A philosopher (usually told of Pythagoras) married his daughter to his enemy, in order that he might wreak vengeance upon him. *Ibid.* (LXXXVI) Alexander's reply when warned that a doctor might give him poison. Calderón, *Argenis y Poliarco*, II, 12, Tirso, *La próspera fortuna de don Alvaro de Luna*, II, 3. (LXXXVII) Alexander said that if he were not Alexander, he would like to be Diogenes. Lope, *El villano en su rincón*, ed. Rivad., II, 149 c.[1]...

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

TORONTO.

[1] The above collection—a first gleaning only—will be continued at some future date. *Addenda*: In the catalogue of Puibusque's library (p. 65) occurs the following entry: *Colección de cuentos, fábulas, descripciones, anécdotas,...de comedias españolas, por don Pablo de Xérica. Burdeos*, 1831. (I) See Rodriguez Marín, *Cantos populares*, IV, 197; (VII) Paz y Melia's *Sales*... 11, 40; (X) Guicciardini, *Detti*... 224; (XVI) *Ibid.*, 185; (XVIII) Montanus, ed. Bolte, 615. According to Bolte, Guicciardini, in the *Hore*... 1572, 276, tells the story of Frederick. In the same author's *Detti*..., 202, it is narrated, however, of Conrad.

THE SOUNDS OF WEST MIDDLE GERMAN AS SPOKEN AT MARBURG AN DER LAHN.

I PROPOSE in the following paper to give an account of the sounds of the *Umgangssprache* which is familiar to me in my native town, Marburg an der Lahn. Although in the first instance an analysis of my own speech, it may be taken as representing that of the educated Marburger in general.

Survey of the organic movements and positions.

The articulations of the back of the tongue.

1. The root of the tongue is retracted towards the epiglottis in the articulation of [a] (*hat*) and [a:] (*kam*).

2. The back of the tongue is raised and brought into contact with the uvula in the articulation of [ɣ] (*Reh*) and [×] (*ach*).

The articulations of the main portion of the tongue.

1. Back Series. The main portion of the tongue is pressed into a narrower shape lengthways and bunched up along the ridge. The bilateral compression of the tongue increases gradually in running through the series [a], the first element of the diphthong [ao] (*Haus*), —[o] (*Gott*)—[o:] (*Sohn*)—[u] (*und*)—[u:] (*Mut*). For each of these vowels progressively the tongue assumes a more compressed form, and the point of its highest elevation is gradually shifted upwards and forwards within that part of the mouth cavity roofed by the soft palate. The articulation culminates in the formation of a complete closure for [ŋ], [g], and [k].

2. Front Series. The main portion of the tongue is raised, swelled and spread out under the hard palate, the point of highest elevation of the tongue being gradually shifted upwards and forwards in passing through the series [ɸ] (*Götz*)—[e] (*Fell, hält*), [y] (*hübsch*)—[ɸ:] (*Goethe*)—[e:] (*See, Bär*), [y:] (*Mühe*)—[i] (*mit*)—[i:] (*sie*). The articulation culminates in the formation of a friction channel for [j] and [ç].

In the diphthongs [ae] (*mein*), [oy] (*heute*), [ui] (*pfui*) the tongue glides from a back to a front position.

The articulations of the fore part of the tongue.

The blade and point of the tongue, which have no active part in the production of the above sounds, are brought into activity in the articulation of [s], [ʃ], [l], [n], [d], [t]. [s] and [ʃ] are blade consonants. In [l], [n], [d], [t], the point articulates against the alveolar arch, with central contact in [l], with complete closure in [n], [d], [t].

The articulations of the lips.

1. Lip-articulation in connection with tongue-articulation. There are two kinds of lip-rounding: (*a*) outer rounding, in the front-round vowels and immediately following [ɣ], [×], [j] and [ç]; (*b*) inner rounding, in the back-round vowels and immediately following [ɣ] and [×]. Protrusion is very marked in [ʃ]. Spreading occurs in very emphatic [e:] and [i:].

2. Lip and lip-teeth sounds, in the formation of which the tongue has no active part. Bilabial, bilabio-dental, or labio-dental slit-opening in [ʋ]; labio-dental slit-opening in [f]; bilabial or bilabio-dental complete closure in [m], [b], [p].

The individual sounds are as follows:

VOWELS.

Murmur Vowels.

The usual form of [ə] is a glide with no definite superlaryngeal articulation except the closure of the nose passage and a moderate opening of the mouth. The glide or murmur vowel of normally unstressed prefixes may be raised to [e] or [e:] respectively when emphasised in a contrast, e.g., *nicht verkauft, sondern gekauft* [niçt ˈfe×kaoft, sondɣη ˈge:kaoft]. A back-modified glide or murmur vowel develops between a long vowel and a back-lateral, so that e.g. *nach* [na:×], *Buch* [bu:×], *mir* [mi:ɣ], have practically the value of [na:ᵃ×], [bu:ᵒ×], [mi:ᵊɣ].

Back Vowels.

The whole body of the tongue, retaining its natural comparatively flat shape, is retracted so that the root is drawn backwards and down-

wards towards the epiglottis, and the tip moves away from the front teeth, against which it rests in ordinary breathing.

1. Low-back-wide [a]. It is heard in *Guten Tag* [gun'da×], *Jagd, Spass, Haselnuss, Kladderadatsch, habt, gehabt, sagst, sagt, gesagt,* and sometimes in *hab, sag.* It is dropped in the weak forms of *darin, das, man* [mɣ].

2. Low-back-halfnarrow [a:]. The root of the tongue is more energetically drawn in than in [a]. The lower jaw is lowered and the aperture is more widely opened than in the case of any other vowel. [a:] is reduced to [a] in proclitic position: *da liegt's, jawohl.* Cp. *Drama, dramatisch* [dɣa:ma:, dɣama:tiʃ].

In the back vowels the tongue is drawn down from the position of rest, while in back-round, front, and front-round vowels it is raised. Hence [a:], the more fully developed of the two back vowels, shows a wider oral air-passage than the less-developed [a]. In the back-round, front, and front-round vowels, the opposite is the case, viz., the configurative passage is progressively narrowed from the lowest grade through the more developed stages.

Back-round Vowels.

From the position of rest, in which it lies comparatively flat on the floor of the mouth, touching the lateral rows of teeth, and resting with its tip against the front teeth, the tongue is pressed into a narrower shape lengthways by bilateral compression of its main portion. The tongue, as it were, retires from either side to the centre. It is entirely withdrawn from the teeth and appears contracted and bunched up all along its ridge. As the centre towards which this bilateral compression is directed lies in the main portion, the tongue is raised at the back and slopes down to the point. The bilateral compression of the tongue is accompanied by lateral compression of the cheeks (inner rounding).

1. Mid-back-wide-round [o]. The tongue is only slightly compressed and raised; if we unround [o] we see that the greater portion of the uvula is still visible in the mirror. The lip-rounding does not extend beyond a slight lateral compression of the corners of the mouth. [o] is heard in *schon, gehorsam, grob.* In final unstressed *-or* it is reduced to a murmur, e.g., in *Doktor.*

2. Mid-back-narrow-round [o:]. The bilateral compression of the tongue is increased, and so, in consequence, are the declivity of the tongue on either side and its slope towards the point. The degree of

approximation between the tongue and the roof of the mouth is such that only the highest part of the soft palate becomes visible if [o:] is unrounded. The point of highest elevation of the tongue lies further forward than in [o]. The lip-rounding assumes more distinctly the character of lateral compression of the cheeks: the central lip-aperture is slightly protruded. [o:] is reduced to [o] in proclitic position, e.g., *sogleich.*

3. High-back-wide-round [u]. The bilateral compression of the tongue is again increased, the point of highest elevation of the tongue is shifted further upwards and forwards than in [o:]. But there is a general relaxation of the muscles concerned in the articulation; the lip-rounding is less energetic, the lip-aperture is wider. [u] is heard in *Spuck, Schuster, Wuchs, Geburt, genug.*

4. High-back-narrow-round [u:]. The compression of the tongue and cheeks is more fully and energetically developed than in [o:]. The point of highest elevation of the tongue lies further forward than in [u], almost under the highest point of the palatal arch; if we unround [u:] we see that the whole of the soft palate disappears behind the bunched-up tongue. The lip-opening is reduced to a narrow central aperture, and this lies at some distance from the front teeth, so that the oral resonance chamber is enlarged in front. [u:] is reduced to [u] in proclitic positions, e.g., *du bist, zu Haus, Guten Morgen* [guˈmoɣjn], *Guten Tag* [gunˈda×], *Guten Abend* [guˈnaːmnt], *Gute Nacht* [guˈna×t]; to [ə] in enclitic *du*, e.g., *hast du* [hasdə], *wenn du* [ʋendə].

Front and front-round Vowels.

The centre from which front and front-round vowel articulation emanates is situated, like that of back-round vowel articulation, in the main portion of the tongue, in the back rather than in the middle. But the tendency of front and front-round vowels is centrifugal, as contrasted with the centripetal character of back-round vowels. From the position of rest, the tongue is raised, the main portion is broadly swelled and spread out under the palatal arch, the blade hollowed out from below and curved forward in front, the tip pointing down behind the lower front teeth.

Front Vowels.

1. Mid-front-wide [e̞]. It is heard in *Lebtag, Krebs, Brezel, Ems, Paket, erst, gebt,* and sometimes in *geb.* It is reduced to a glide or dropped in the weak forms of *des, denn.*

2. Mid-front-narrow raised [e:]. The curvature of the main portion of the tongue is more convex, and the angle of the jaws is smaller than in [e]. [e:] is the sound of *e* and *ä*, when long, corresponding to earlier *a*, *â*, *e*, *ë*, *œ*, or *ê*. Both [e] and [e:] occur in *nächste*. [e:] is reduced to a murmur or dropped in the weak forms of *es, er, der, den, dem.*

3. High-front-wide [i]. It is heard in *Fiedel, Wiesbaden, Titel, -ik* and *-it*, e.g., in *Musik, Granit*; *vielleicht, dieser, vierzehn, vierzig, Viertel, liegst, liegt, kriegst, kriegt, gekriegt, wieder*, and sometimes in *liege, kriege.* It may be dropped in proclitic *ich.*

4. High-front-narrow [i:]. It is reduced to [i] in proclitic *die, sie, wie*; to [ə] in the weak forms of *sie, Sie*; to a glide or altogether dropped in the weak forms of *dir, ihm, ihr, ihn* and *ihnen* [n], *mir* and *wir* [mɣ].

The four front vowels represent progressive shiftings of the tongue upwards and forwards. As the [e]-position itself is considerably higher than the position of rest, the total distance covered by the tongue in running through the series [e]—[e:]—[i]—[i:] is much smaller than in [o]—[o:]—[u]—[u:].

Front-round Vowels.

1. Low-front-wide-round [ɸ].
2. Mid-front-wide-round [y] (e rounded).
3. Mid-front-narrow-round [ɸ:].
4. Mid-front-narrow-round raised [y:] (e: rounded). This is sometimes reduced to [y] in unemphasised *über.*

In the front-round vowels, the tongue, broadly spread out, leaves no scope for lateral compression of the cheeks, which accompanies the back-round vowels, and the lips are brought together vertically, without pouting (outer rounding). The outer lip-rounding, which gradually increases in [ɸ]—[y]—[ɸ:]—[y:], is a less energetic and less elaborate form of lip-articulation than the inner lip-rounding of the back-round vowels. Front-round vowels are therefore easily unrounded, and front vowels are substituted dialectally for front-round vowels.

Note. Narrow vowels. Secondary phenomena of very energetic narrowing are: a feeling of general contraction in the back of the mouth in the case of back and back-round vowels ([a:], [o:], [u:]), tension of the lip muscles in round vowels ([o:], [u:], [ɸ:], [y:]), lip-spreading in front vowels ([e:], [i:]).

Diphthongs.

1. [ao]. Mid-back-wide [a] + mid-back-wide-round [o]. The first element is an [a], produced by a very slight bilateral compression of the main portion of the tongue; then the tongue-compression increases and the lip-aperture decreases until the [o]-articulation is reached.

2. [ae]. Outer low-back-wide [a] + mid-front-wide [e]. The tongue is first slightly retracted, but not quite so much as in [a] of *hat, Mann*, and then raised until the [e]-articulation is reached. The lips remain passive. The earlier *ei* is monophthongised ([e:]) in [ne:] (dialectally for *nein*). [ae] is reduced to [ə] in the weak forms of *einmal* [əmal], [əma:], *einander* [ənandɣ], and dropped in the weak forms of *ein* [n], *eine* [nə], *einem* [nm], [m], *einmal* [ma:l], [ma:].

3. [oy]. Low-back-wide-round raised [o] + low-front-wide-round raised [y]. The tongue is first slightly compressed (not quite so much as in the first element of [ao]), then released and raised towards the [y]-position. The lips move from inner to outer rounding[1].

4. [ui]. High-back-wide-round [u] + high-front-wide [i]. The tongue is more compressed and bunched up for the first element, more flattened and spread out for the second element, than in [oy]. The lips relapse from high inner rounding into passivity.

Consonants.

1. [ʔ] glottal stop.

The glottal stop occurs in connection with a syllable-impulse, as on-glide of most initial vowels.

The following, however, have no glottal stop, the syllable-impulse being shifted from the vowel to the preceding consonant:

Enclitic pronouns, e.g., *will ich* [ʋiliç], *muss es* [musəs]; *an, in, ob, aus, auf, um, unter, über, ab, ein*, as far as they form the second elements of compounds with *hin-, her-, vor-, hier-, dar-, wor-, war-, wieder-*; *an* in *wohlan*; *in* in *erinnern, Erinnerung*; *ein* in *allein*; *ander* in *einander, selbander*; *all* in *überall*; *Acht* in *in Acht, Obacht, beobachten*; *Ende* in *vollenden, Vollendung, vollends*, and sometimes in *am Ende*;

[1] [oy] is practically the rounded form of [ae] by which it is replaced dialectally: the change in the first element of the diphthong [o]>[a] is the only case in which a back-round vowel is unrounded (by giving up the very slight inner rounding of [o]), while the change in the second element [y]>[e] is merely another example of the usual dialectal substitution of front for front-round vowels.

au in *Friedenau, Amönau, Röddenau, Rabenau,* etc.; *Abend* in *Guten Abend.*

Popular etymology is responsible for the glottal stop in *Hebamme.*

2. [h] aspirate.

The aspirate occurs, in connection with a syllable-impulse, as on-glide of vowels, (1) in the absolute beginning of syllables, as in *Hausherr,* (2) after stressed initial [p] (aspiration), as in *Pein, Post.* Unstressed *he* of *her-* and *hi* of *hin-* are dropped in colloquial use, e.g., *herein* [γaen], *hinaus* [naos].

3. [γ] back-lateral-voice[1]; [×] back-lateral.

[γ] and [×] are the furthest back of my oral consonants, the fricative noise being produced by the expired air at its very entrance from the pharynx into the oral cavity, between the raised back of the tongue and the posterior boundary of the soft palate. As the back of the tongue is raised it lifts up the uvula so that the latter, supported by the tongue, bisects the expiratory channel. The height of the tongue and the area of its contact with the uvula depend on the energy of articulation. In a lenis [γ][2] the slightly raised tongue only just touches the end of the pendant uvula, but in a fortis [×] the back of the tongue is considerably raised, and the whole of the lower surface of the uvula rests upon it, while fortis [γ] and lenis [×] represent intermediate stages. (In my own pronunciation the uvula, when thus supported by the raised back of the tongue, is not stretched forward in the medial line, but more or less turned to the left so that a wider expiratory channel remains open on the right than on the left side.)

Retraction of the tongue is not an essential feature of the [γ]- and [×]-articulations, but merely an accessory phenomenon after [a] and [a:], and so is the bilateral compression of the tongue after back-round vowels. After front and front-round vowels the tongue is raised at the back and flat in front.

After rounded vowels [γ] and [×] partake of the lip-rounding and are therefore lip-modified back-laterals, in the production of which the lip-rounding is prior in time, but the tongue-articulation the predominant feature.

[1] Cp. H. Mutschmann, 'My pronunciation of German r,' *Modern Language Notes,* XXIII, 3, pp. 67—69.

[2] The intensity of a non-stopped consonant being greater after a stressed short vowel than in any other position, we call [γ] [×] 'fortis' after a stressed short vowel, otherwise 'lenis.' Cp. Bremer, *Deutsche Phonetik,* §98.

[×], spelt *ch*, is liable to be reduced to [ɣ] when medial between [u:], [ao] and a vowel or nasal, e.g., *such einmal* [su:ɣəma:], *suchen* [su:ɣn], *brauchen* [bɔɣaoɣn]; also in proclitic *nach* before [ʔ], [h], [n], [l], [m], e.g., *nach Altona, nach Hamburg, nach Nauheim, nach London, nach Marburg.*

Corresponding to South German back-stop after a back or back-round vowel, we have (1) [ɣ] medially before a vowel, [ɣ], [l], or nasal, e.g., *Auge* [aoɣə], *Tag und Nacht* [da:ɣu'na×t], *sag ich* [sa:ɣiç], *lag er* and *Lager* [la:ɣɣ], *Vogel* [fo:ɣl], *sagen* [sa:ɣn]; (2) [×] before voiceless final consonants and at the absolute end of syllables, e.g., *sagt, sagst, Jagd* [ja×t], *jagt* [ja:×t], *Magd, behagt, taugt, Vogt; Tag, Taglöhner, Wagner, zagten, Aug' um Aug', genug* [gənu×], *Zug, Zugluft.*

Corresponding to older point-trill, we find (1) [ɣ] before vowels, [ʔ], [h], [ŋ], [j], [l], [n], [ʋ], [m], [bm], e.g., *Laura, uralt* [ʔuɣʔalt], *Narrheit, kerngesund* [keɣŋgəsunt], *borge* [boɣjə], *Kerl, Hirn, Erbe* [eɣvə], *arm, erben* [eɣbm]; (2) [×] before [k], [g], [ç], [s], [ʃ], [t], [f], [p], [b] (except [bm]), e.g., *Mark* [ma×k], *Herrgott* [he×got], *Kirche* [ki×çə], *Vers* [fexs], *herrschen* [he×ʃn], *hart* and *harrt* [ha×t], *scharf* [ʃa×f], *Korb* [ko×p], *Marburg* [ma×bu×ç]. Before [d] we have [ɣ] in lenis-position, e.g., *Erde* [e:ɣdə], but [×] in fortis-position, e.g., *Karte* [ka×də].

There is no difference in the pronunciation of (1) *Wacht* and *ward* [ʋa×t], *mocht* and *Mord* [mo×t], *Wucht* and *wurd'* [ʊu×t] (fortis ×); (2) *behagt* and *behaart* [bəha:×t] (lenis ×); and (3) *Wagen* and *waren* [ʋa:ɣn], *behagen* and *behaaren* [bəha:ɣn], *saugen* and *sauren* [saoɣn], *bogen* and *bohren* [bo:ɣn], *verlogen* and *verloren* [fɣlo:ɣn] (lenis ɣ), unless *g* under (3) is raised to a sound intermediate between [ɣ] and [×] in order to prevent mistakes.

Lenis [ɣ] is dropped at the end of a breath-group so that only the preceding murmur-vowel remains, e.g., *Es geht ihm schon besser* [sge:dm ʃom besə].

Fortis [ɣ] at the end of a breath-group is readily raised to [×], especially in exclamations and when otherwise used emphatically, e.g., *Mein Herr! Du Narr! Er hat einen Katarrh.*

[ɣəɣ] > [ɣɣ] (=[ɣ:] with a fresh syllable-impulse within it), e.g., *Lehrer* [le:ɣɣ].

[ɣɣ] > [ɣ], e.g., *Fahrrad* [fa:ɣa:t], *nach Rom* [na:'ɣo:m], *verraten* [fəɣa:dn][1].

[1] In all cases where identical or approximately identical consonants are contiguous, the immediate repetition of the articulatory movements is avoided as inconvenient and the two consonants merge into one. Cp. Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 131.

4. [ŋ] back-nasal-voice; [g], [k] back-stops.

The main portion of the tongue is bunched up lengthways by bilateral compression beyond the [u:]-elevation, until in complete contact with the roof of the mouth. Even in the articulation of inner [ŋ], [g], [k], before and after back and back-round vowels, the tongue rises well up on the palatal arch, and in the neighbourhood of front and front-round vowels, the place of the stop-formation lies still further forward.

The essential difference between [k] and [g] lies in the greater air-pressure and stronger articulation of [k]. No effort is made to distinguish between initial *kr* and *gr*, *kl* and *gl*, *kn* and *gn*.—Medially before voiced sounds, all back-stops are levelled to [g], e.g., *Lücke* [lygə], *Roggen* [ɣogŋ], *Ekel* [e:gl], *Paket* [page:t], *Balkon* [bal'goŋ].—*Kuckuck* is pronounced [gugu:k].—*ch* before superlative *-st* is pronounced [k], e.g., *höchst*, *nächste*.

[kk], [kg] > [k], e.g., *zurückkehren* [tsu'ɣyke:ɣn], *Rückgrat* [ɣykɣa:t].

Combinations of back-stops with back-nasals. One oral stop-formation serves for two, three, or four sounds in combination, a nasal plosive being substituted for a back-stop before [ŋ], e.g., *Dank* [daŋk], *angenehm* [aŋgəne:m], *Haken* [ha:gŋ], *Roggen* [ɣogŋ], *Brückenkopf* [bɣygŋkopf], *Brückengeländer* [bɣygŋgəlendɣ], *denken* [deŋgŋ], *Gedankenkreis* [gədaŋgŋkɣaes], *Gedankengang* [gədaŋgŋgaŋ].

The back-stop is dropped between [ŋ] and [s], [ʃ], [t], e.g., *links* [liŋs], *links schwenkt* [liŋ ʃveŋt].

5. [j] front-open-voice; [ç] front-open.

The main portion of the tongue, expanded under the hard palate, is advanced and raised beyond the [i:]-position, until the air-opening is reduced to a friction channel.

After front-round vowels [j] and [ç] partake of the outer lip-rounding and are therefore lip-modified front-open consonants, in the production of which the lip-rounding is prior in time, but the tongue-articulation the predominant feature.

Corresponding to South German back-stop we have after a front or front-round vowel, [ɣ], or [l], (1) [j] medially before a vowel, [ɣ], [l], or nasal, e.g., *Wege*, [ve:jə], *lieg ich* [li:jiç], *ärger* [eɣjɣ], *Hügel* [hy:jl], *balgen* [baljn], *Morgen* [moɣjn]; (2) [ç] before voiceless final consonants and at the absolute end of syllables, e.g., *legst*, *Kriegs*, *vergnügt*, *borgt* [bo×çt], *balgt; weg*, *Weg*, *wenig*, *König*, *Sieg*, *arg* [a×ç], *Balg*.

For *regnet* we find [γe:çnət] or [γe:jnt], according to syllable division; similarly, *eigner* [aeçnγ] or [aejənγ]; etc.

Asyllabic front vowels are replaced by [j], e.g., *Lineal* [linja:l], *ideal* [idja:l], *Julius* [ju:ljus], *Asien* [a:sjn], *Italiener* [italje:nγ], *Staniol* [ʃdanjo:l], *Religion* [γeljo:n].

The front-open consonant is dropped in *-lich* and *-ig* before an inflectional [ə], e.g., *verherrlichen* [fγ'heγliən], *herzliche* [he×tsliə], *heiligen* [haeliən], *heiliger* [haeliəγ].

[ç] is dropped colloquially in *nicht* [nit]; [çt] > [k] in *nichts* [niks].

6. [s] blade-open.

A narrow friction-channel is formed by broadening the blade of the tongue under the alveolar arch, allowing the tip to rest against the upper gums, while the teeth are very nearly closed. Shifting occurs from inner to outer [s], e.g., in *säuseln.*

[ss] > [s], e.g., *aussehen* [aose:n].

[sʃ] > [ʃʃ] > [ʃ], e.g., *Hausschlüssel* [haoʃlysl], *Aussprache* [aoʃbγa:×ə], *was Schönes* [va ʃϕ:nəs].

[stʃd] > [ʃd], e.g., *Kunststück* [kunʃdyk].

7. [ʃ] lip-modified blade-open.

The alveolar friction-channel of [s] is somewhat widened, the blade and point of the tongue being lowered. The lips are protruded as far as possible, so that while laterally pressing against the teeth, they are considerably removed from the front teeth. The cheeks and lips thus form, as it were, a speaking trumpet for the sound.

[ʃʃ] > [ʃ], e.g., *Waschschüssel* [vaʃysl].

8. [l] point-lateral-voice; [n] point-nasal-voice; [d], [t] point-stops.

The place of articulation is subject to shifting under the influence of the phonetic environment, although not to the same extent as in [η], [g], [k]. The articulation is inner before the diphthongs [ae], [oy], [ui], and outer after them, e.g., in *nein, deute, Leiter, Leute, Luitpold.*

The transition from [l] to point-nasal or point-stop is made by completing the closure which is only partial for [l], e.g., in *Köln, alte.* The transition from point-nasal or point-stop to [l] is made by means of lateral explosion only, instead of central and lateral, e.g., in *Anlass, edle, hoffentlich, entlehnen.*

[ll] > [l], e.g., *Wohllaut* [vo:laot].

[l] is dropped in the weak forms of *einmal* [əma:], [ma:].

Non-initial [n] is assimilated, as regards place of articulation, to

preceding or following back-nasal or back-stop ([n] > [ŋ]) and lip-consonants ([n] > [m]), e.g., *singen* [siŋŋ] ([ŋŋ] = [ŋ:] with a fresh syllable-impulse within it), *Haken* [ha:gŋ], *Roggen* [ɣogŋ], *Unglück* [uŋglyk], *ankommen* [aŋkomm], *nehmen* [ne:mm] ([mm] = [m:] with a fresh syllable-impulse within it), *Lippen* [libm], *Leben* [le:bm] with nasal plosive, *Eisenbahn* [aesmba:n], *ein paar* [m pa:ɣ], *Senf* [semf] and *laufen* [laofm], with bilabio-dental [m].

[n] is protected against the assimilative power of a back-nasal or back-stop or lip-teeth consonant by a neighbouring blade- or point-consonant on its other side, e.g., *jungen Zweig* [juŋn tsʋaeç], *meinen Gästen* [maenn gestn], *den Fall* [dn fal], *laufen schon* [laofn ʃon].

The grammatical difference between *den* and *dem*, *in* and *im*, etc. does not prevent the assimilation of [n] > [m]. Thus I say, heedless of grammar: *Ein Eisenbahnzug setzte sich in Bewegung* [aen ʔaesmba:ntsu:× setstə siç im bəʋe:juŋ], treating *in Bewegung* in the same way as *Eisenbahn*.

The assimilative tendency of [f] ([n] > bilabio-dental [m]) is overruled by the stronger assimilative power of a back-nasal or back-stop on the other side of [n], e.g., *laufen gelassen* [laofŋ gəlasn].

an, *in*, *um* are not assimilated to following [f].

[nən], [nn] > [n], e.g., *seinen* [saenn] ([nn] = [n:] with a fresh syllable impulse within it), [saen]; *ihnen*, *einen* [n], *Einnahme* [aena:mə].

Final [n] is dropped in [ne:], dialectally for *nein*.

The essential difference between [t] and [d] lies in the greater air-pressure and stronger articulation of [t].

Initial [d] may be heard in the following: *Taps*, *tappen*, *Tabak*, *Tapete*, *Tante*, *Tanz*, *tanzen*, *Tasse*, *Tasche*, *Tambour*, *Tag*, *Taler*, *Tafel*, *taub*, *Taube*, *taugen*, *tauchen*, *tausend*, *tauschen*, *taufen*, *Teich*, *Teig*, *toll*, *Topf*, *Tochter*, *Tolpatsch*, *teuer*, *Teufel*, *Tod*, *tot*, *toben*, *Tusch*, *Tusche*, *Tüte* [dudə], *tunken*, *tun*, *Teller*, *Teppich*, *Tisch*, *Tinte*, *Tippelchen*, *tief*, *tüchtig*, *Tür*.

Initial *st*, as in *Stein*, *gestehen*, has the value of voiceless [ʃd].

No effort is made to distinguish between initial *tr* and *dr*.

Medially, before voiced sounds, all point-stops are levelled to [d], e.g., *retten* [ɣedn], *raten* [ɣa:dn], *laden* [la:dn], (*Apotheke* [abo'de:gə], *Bibliothek* [biblio'de:k]).

Combinations of point-stops with point-nasals. One oral stop-formation is kept throughout the combination, with nasal instead of oral plosive before [n], e.g., *Hand*, *Linde*, *bitten* [bidn], *Rattentod* [ɣadnto:t], *Guten Tag* [gu:dn'da×], *Renten* [ɣendn], *Linden* [lindn], *entnehmen*

[entne:mm], *Bündner* [byndnɣ], *Rententeil* [ɣendntael], *Lindenduft* [lindnduft].

[dət] > [t] in *schadet* [ʃa:t], [ʃat], *kostet* [kost].

[tt], [td] > [t], [d], e.g., *mitteilen* [mitaeln], *Notdach* [no:da×], *hast du* [hasdə].

[ndn] > [nn] > [n]: *in den* [indn], [inn], [in], *an den* [andn], [ann], [an].

[dn], [də-n] > [n]: *den, denn* [n], *Guten Tag* [gun'da×], *Guten Abend* [gu'na:mnt], *Gute Nacht* [gu'na×t], and, through assimilation of [n] to [m], *Guten Morgen* [gu'moɣjn].

[dm] > [m]: *dem* [m].

[lts] > [ls], e.g., *Salz* [sals], *hältst* [helst].

[nts] > [ns], e.g., *Landsmann* [lansman], *ganz* [gans].

[ntʃ] > [nʃ], e.g., *Handschuh* [hanʃu:].

The point-stop can be dropped in *ich werd'* and *wir, sie werden.*

The final point-stop is dropped in unemphasised *und, ist, sind, jetzt* (the older form), *braucht.*

A final point-stop is sometimes dropped in rapid conversation before [gə-], e.g., *Hast du den Hans nicht gesehen?* [hasdə dn hans ni gəse:n?]

9. [ʋ] lip-open-voice or lip-teeth-open-voice; [f] lip-teeth-open.

Three articulations of [ʋ] occur:

(1) bilabial, i.e., the lips are brought together vertically beyond the outer-lip-rounding of [y:], forming a slit-shaped friction-channel for the expired air;

(2) bilabio-dental, i.e., the lower lip, slightly retracted, is in contact both with the upper lip and with the edge of the upper front teeth;

(3) labio-dental, i.e., the central portion of the lower lip is entirely withdrawn from the upper lip and pressed against the edge of the upper front teeth.

Bilabial [ʋ] is the sound of medial b, preceded and followed by a vowel, [ɣ], or [l], e.g., *habe* [ha:ʋə], *über* [y:ʋɣ], *Nebel* [ne:ʋl], (*kapabel, kurabel*); *Erbe* [eɣʋə], *Elbe* [elʋə], *derber* [deɣʋɣ], *Wirbel* [ʋiɣʋl], *albern* [alʋɣn], *Vilbel* [filʋl], *hab ich* [ha:viç], *Schreiber* and *schreib ihr* [ʃɣaeʋɣ], *Obacht, beobachten, Tabak, Übung, lebendig, Lebendigkeit, Arbeit, salbungsvoll.* Before a distinct vowel-quality there is, however, a tendency to fall into the spelling pronunciation of *b* as a stopped consonant. The stop prevails in *Habicht* (dialectal *Hobch*), *Kibitz* and proper names, e.g., *Laban.*

Bilabial [ʋ] is further the established form of the V-sound after [k] and [ts], e.g., in *Quelle, Hackwalzer, zwei, Zwang, Kurzwaren.*

[ʋ] after [f], as in *aufwärts,* is, of course, labio-dental.

Except in these cases, the provinces of bilabial, bilabio-dental, and labio-dental [ʋ] are not rigidly defined in my speech.

Final [ʋn] > [bm], with nasal plosive, e.g., *Löwen* [lɸ:bm].

[ff] > [f], e.g., *Schiffahrt* [ʃifa:×t].

10. [m] lip-nasal-voice or lip-teeth-nasal-voice; [b], [p] lip-stops or lip-teeth-stops.

The articulation of [m], [b], [p] in the neighbourhood of [ʋ], e.g., in *am Wehr, abwärts,* can be bilabial or bilabio-dental, like the articulation of [ʋ]; in the neighbourhood of [f] it is always bilabio-dental, e.g., in *laufen* [laofm], *am Feuer, Kampf* [kamf], *abfahren* [apfa:ɣn].

[məm] > [mm] (= [m:], with a fresh syllable-impulse within it), e.g., *lahmem* [la:mm][1].

[mm], [nm] > [m], e.g., *am Meer* [a'me:ɣ], *unmöglich* [umɸ:çliç], (*seinem* [saem]).

[bnd], [bnt] > [mnd], [mnt], owing to premature opening of the nose passage, e.g., *lebendes* [le:mndəs], *Abend* [a:mnt], [n] being protected by the point-stop against the assimilative power of [m].

The essential difference between [p] and [b] lies in the greater air-pressure and stronger articulation of [p].

Initial [p] before a vowel is aspirated.

Initial [b] may be heard in the following:—*Papa, Papier, Pappe, pappen, passen, passieren, patschen, paff* (sprachlos), *paperlapapp, pardanz, Peitsche, Partei, Partie, -possen, -polstern, potztausend, Portion, Poree, pumpen, putzen, purzeln, puffen, Puffärmel, Puppe, Pulle* (Flasche), *-pelz, -pinsel, -pinseln.*

Initial *pf* has the value of [f], e.g., *Pfund* [funt].

Initial *sp,* as in *spitz, besprechen,* has the value of voiceless [ʃb].

No effort is made to distinguish between initial *pr* and *br, pl* and *bl.*

Medially before voiced sounds the lip-stops are levelled to [b], e.g., *Lippe* [libə], *Ebbe* [ebə], (*Apotheke* [abo'dc:gə], *Teppich* [debiç], but [p] in *Apostel, Epistel*).

Combinations of lip-stops with lip-nasals. One oral stop-formation is kept throughout the combination, with nasal instead of oral plosive

[1] *lahm* [la:m], *laben* [la:bm], *lahmem, lahmen* [la:mm].—*Raum* [ɣaom], *rauben* [ɣaobm], *rauhem* [ɣaoəm].

before [m], e.g., *Lump, anpassen* [ampasn], *ein paar* [m pa:ɣ], *September, anbeissen* [ambaesn], *Eisenbahn* [aesmba:n], *Lippen* [libm], *Tropen* [tɣo:bm], *Leben* [le:bm], *Löwen* [lɸ:bm], *Lippenpaar* [libmpa:ɣ], *Lampen* [lambm], *Bomben* [bombm], *der Lump muss, Lumpenpack* [lumbmpak], *Lampenbeleuchtung* [lambmbəloyçduŋ].

[pp] > [p], e.g., *abpassen* [apasn].

[pb] > [b], [p], e.g., *Abbitte* [abitə], *abbrechen* [apɣeçn].

[mpf] > [mf], e.g., *Kampf* [kamf].

Nasal plosive + [m] > [m], e.g., *gib mir* [gimɣ].

JULIUS FREUND.

SHEFFIELD.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Fragment of a Middle English Poem.

In the *Modern Language Review* for January, 1909, at p. 236, I am glad to find a piece of a genuine Middle English love-song. The language is certainly, as suggested, of the beginning of the fourteenth century, as the spelling shows. Like many other pieces of that date, it exhibits some Norman misspellings, such as I have noted in my Preface to *Havelok the Dane*.

Examples are: *nk* for *ng*; *sprinkes* for *springes*, i.e., shoots up. Also *icche* for *ich*, I, the Southern form; though *i* occurs also, and suits the verbal suffix *-es* much better; so that, for *icche* we should read *i*. As usual, *ine* is written for *i ne*. The spelling *singge* is phonetic; as *ng* was so pronounced. *Yider* has *y* for the thorn-letter; so it means *thider*. Conversely, *thiif* is an error for *yif*, if. *Sal* is for *shal*. The great difficulty is to show the metre, which is somewhat intricate.

The first three lines form the 'burden' of the song, and are to be taken separately. After that come three stanzas, of seven lines each; but at first sight irregular in form, because the scribe has turned *Als I me rod this ender dai* into *this endre dai als i me rod*. But it so happens that we have a poem of the same period beginning likewise with *Ase y me rod this ender day*; see Böddeker's *Altenglische Dichtungen des MS. Harl.* 2253; p. 218. This suggests further that the poem may come from the West-Midland (see the same, p. 146, where *wyrhale* means Wirrall). It should therefore be compared, as to grammar, with Morris's Alliterative Poems. There are but few 'hard words'; we may note *seke*, sick, ill; *this ender dai*, this recent day, lately; *wai*, woe; *i*, in; *libben ai*, live always; *drogh*, drew; *herber*, garden; *swote*, sweet; *mai*, maiden; *lemman*, lover; *bi-hot*, promised; *a-newe*, afresh. As for *clot*, it means a mass of clay; and *clinge* is to adhere. The rime shows that *clinges* should be *clinge*; and I take *The clot him clinge* to be an imprecation, 'may the earth adhere over him,' i.e., may he be dead and buried! By *seih*, I mean 'saw.'

As to the word *pleyinge*, i.e., 'amusement,' it is clearly suggested by the poem already alluded to, which begins:

Ase y me rod this ender day
By grene wode *to seche play*.

I would therefore 'restore' the poem as follows:

NOW SPRINGS THE SPRAY.

Now springes the sprai!—
Al for loue i am so seke
That slepen i ne mai!

Als i me rod this ender dai
O mi [pleyinge],
S[ei]h i hwar a litel mai
Bigan to singe:—
'The clot him clinge!
Wai es him i loue-longinge
Shal libben ai!'
Now springes, etc.

Sone i herde that mirie note;
Thider I drogh;
I fond hire [in] an herber swote
Under a bogh,
With ioie inogh.
Sone I asked—'Thou mirie mai,
Hwi singes-tou ai?'
Now springes, etc.

Than answerde that maiden swot
Mid wordes fewe—
'Mi lemman me haues bi-hot
Of loue trewe:
He chaunges a-newe.
Yif i mai, it shal him rewe
Bi this dai!'
Now springes, etc.

I take the two last lines to mean—'If I can (contrive it), it shall repent him concerning this day.' This seems better than taking *Bi this dai* as a form of affirmation.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

SHAKESPEARE, *Macbeth*, III iv 89—92.

> I drinke to th' generall ioy o' th' whole Table,
> And to our deere Friend *Banquo*, whom we misse:
> Would he were heere: to all, and him we thirst,
> And all to all.

The First Folio punctuates as above. The Second, Third, and Fourth still further emphasize the pause after *all* by changing the comma into a semicolon, thus:

> Would he were heere: to all; and him we thirst.

Yet the editors, with one consent, tacitly either remove the comma after *all* or insert one after *him*, apparently understanding the passage to mean 'We thirst [i.e. drink] to all and to him.' But the punctuation of the Folios may be retained if we take *thirst* transitively in the sense 'desire,' 'long for.' The sentence would then mean '(I drink) to all, and to him whom we desire,' i.e., 'Banquo, whom we misse' (l. 90).

For *thirst* = 'desire,' cf. Udall, *Paraphrasė of Erasmus vpon Luke*, fol. iiii (*b*) 'hounger and thirst the syncere knowlage of Gods word'; fol. xix 'all suche as do thirst the cummyng of Messias'; fol. xl (*b*) 'thirste the mystycall sence and meaning.'

W. H. WILLIAMS.

HOBART, TASMANIA.

DISCUSSIONS.

Milton's Heroic Line.

In the *Modern Language Review* for October 1908, Mr T. S. Omond did me the honour to discuss my theory of Milton's epic versification expounded in the three previous numbers for July and October 1907 and April 1908. In reply to these strictures, I should like to offer the following defence of my position which I have delayed till now, not for want of appropriate arguments, but owing to stress of work during the Academic year.

I must at once premise that my theory rests not on the mere fact of personal scansion, which will of course differ with the subjective idiosyncrasy of each metrist, especially at the present day, but on a combination of reasons derived from the history of the language, the history of the decasyllabic metre, the definitions of early metrical theorists and the averred practice of seventeenth century poets and particularly of Milton himself. I attach far less importance to any separate thread of proof taken apart from the rest than to the whole body of evidence at our disposal. Viewing the author's verse 'from an historical standpoint,' I beg to draw attention to the concurrent lines of argument on which I rely to make my case clear. Broadly speaking, my main contention is that 'the more careful utterance with which we naturally read great poetry' (p. 96)[1] is out of place here, if only because Milton was writing in the reign of Charles II. To say that, if we admit the syllabic doctrine, 'Milton favoured colloquial contractions, surely unsuited to his dignified verse' (p. 100) amounts to committing a virtual anachronism. What we now call vulgar and colloquial really represents an earlier and perfectly dignified stage of the language. As usual in all civilised countries, poetry and popular speech in England prove to be more conservative than the polished and high-flown idiom of the cultivated classes.

But my appeal to tradition and history in opposition to our twentieth century usage is also an appeal to the poet himself. When his note on the verse prefixed to *Paradise Lost* mentions as an element of the heroic line a 'fit quantity of syllables,' I feel bound to take it that the expression implies the actual numbering of syllables, not because I have supposed or discovered decasyllabism to be his constant practice, but on account of his very words. The sense of 'quantity' meaning length of

[1] The references are to the pages of the October number (1908) which contains Mr Omond's strictures.

vowel sound is not classical in Latin and would not commend itself to Milton as a consummate Latin scholar. Indeed the more obvious English phrase in such a case would have been a 'fit quantity *in* syllables' and a careful writer like Milton could hardly have failed to adopt it. Besides the poet was well acquainted with the syllabic theory as the main principle of French, Italian and Spanish versification and would have been less likely than anyone else to insert a misleading or ambiguous term in his metrical manifesto. I may therefore still claim the benefit of Milton's own statement.

May I not even claim Mr Omond's implicit approval, and does he not practically give his case away when he owns that Milton was 'evidently guided by *very strict*[1] principles of metre' and 'achieved his statelier measure by rejecting dramatic laxity' (p. 94), or when he expressly asserts of the decasyllable: 'this is the normal type' (p. 98)? The phrase is on a par with Dr Robert Bridges' declaration that 'in Milton's verse the chief metrical rule is the number of syllables' (*Milton's Prosody*, 1894, p. 68) and such candid admissions are fatal to the pet theories of both metrists. The earliest English critics to deal with the subject are of course still more emphatic. Sir Philip Sidney formally disallows quantity in Elizabethan verse and as concerns stress he speaks of 'some regard' only being paid to the accent (*An Apologie for Poetrie*, Cambridge reprint, 1891, p. 60), while he insists on the number of syllables as the essential factor. George Gascoigne and William Webbe refer to no other[2], and the same theory held good throughout the seventeenth century and till late in the eighteenth. Naturally enough, Mr Omond replies that the decasyllable is 'the most easily recognizable form of the heroic line' and that 'our prosodians have always tended to lay down rules more strict than the practice of our great singers warranted' (p. 95). But the latter contention sounds strange when we consider that the early metrists derived their definition from the practice of still earlier poets, and that no one of them ever hints at any other possible conception of the line. Surely the bare fact is in itself significant. We hear further of the syllabic rule bringing about an 'absolute monotony of rhythm' (p. 98). But how could it, when every other element of Milton's verse, accent, alliteration and caesura, is shown to be variable and suffices to prevent anything like a dead level? We might as well complain of music as being intolerably flat, because the notes in each successive bar are strictly equivalent. On the other hand if, according to the modern hypothesis, every single factor of poetry is liable to unlimited variation, may we not defy Mr Omond or any of his followers to give a clear and accurate definition of such a hotchpotch as the English heroic line would prove to be?

[1] The italics are mine.

[2] A friendly critic kindly draws my attention to the following passage from Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie*, 1589, Book II, Ch. III, which very clearly expounds the views prevalent in the sixteenth century: 'Meeter and measure is all one, for what the Greekes called *μέτρον*, the Latines call *Mensura*, and is but the quantitie of a verse, either long or short. This quantitie with them consisteth in the number of their feete; and with us in the number of sillables, which are comprehended in every verse.'

After the formal statements of present day opponents and old day exponents of the syllabic theory is it necessary to insist on the historical data which vouch for its foundation in fact? I fancy I might refer to what I said in the above-mentioned papers on this part of the subject. But it may be as well to add a few words on the vexed question of common contractions in spoken English some 250 years since. If we bear in mind that Milton was a belated Elizabethan, his reducing *innocent* to *inn'cent* (without any slur at all) or *difficulty* in *P.L.*, III, 1021–22, to *diff'culty*, will not strike us as stranger than our own pronunciation of *diff'rent* for *different*. His indeed was the age which had shortened *perilous* to *parlous*, *capitaine* to *captain*, *chapelain* to *chaplain*, *commandement* to *commandment* and similar instances were fully justified by the drift of current speech. Again my reading *No 'dvantage* in *P.R.*, II, 235 does not involve 'a very rapid' enunciation of 'the initial *a*' (p. 97), but its total suppression, and this is confirmed by the well-known derivation of *vanguard* from *avantgarde*. I also fail to see how any case can be made out historically for the 'trisyllabic ripple' (p. 97), when we remember it was never mentioned by one of the ancient metrists or poets in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and sins against the very spirit of the older English language. Ample proofs of this are to be found in the present paragraph, in the existence of such doublets as *flour* and *flower*, *spirit* and *sprite*, of such rhymes as *hour*, *power* and *tower* (cf. the French *tour*), and in the formation of compound verbs like *to don* and *to doff*, from *to do on* and *to do off*, where the complete elision is certainly no 'fiction of grammarians' (p. 99). So too we may note that Addison in his papers on *Paradise Lost* and Dean Swift both speak of a contemporary tendency to dock words instead of insisting even slightly on the unaccented syllables, a tendency which is responsible for the introduction of *mob* and *cab* derived from *mobile* and *cabriolet*. This was not the kind of mood that would allow the diphthongs in *Adria* or *Hesperian* (*P.L.*, I, 520) to be split as a matter of course. And in Milton we may trace the concurrent influence of Italian usage which does make dissyllables of *Siena* and *duomo* and without the least slurring will fuse as many as three vowels into one syllable (cf. *P.L.*, VII, 411).

That Cowper took the same view of Miltonian elisions is shown by his remark about the poet's 'cutting short a *the*,' where the words can imply nothing else. But his authority is not needed to answer the question: 'Did people really say *tatone* for *to atone*, *thinsane* for *the insane*, etc.?' (p. 98). Popular survivals like *to swear to't* testify to the former[1] and the contraction of the definite article in Elizabethan times was so current as to appear not in verse only, but in prose. It remains to this day a common practice among Lancashire countrymen. In the preface of Dr W. A. Wright's edition of Shakespeare's *Richard the Third* (Clarendon Press, 1895), I find the following instances which

[1] Cf. *t'other* for *the other* in Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*, Bk. III, l. 472; *t'appease* in Spenser's *Faery Queene*, Bk. II, Canto VIII, st. 26 (ed. 1590), and *t'affect* in Bk. II, Canto XII, st. 28.

occur in the extracts from Hall's *Chronicles* reproduced with the original spelling: *thenuy, thother, therle, thende, thenglishmen, thentent*[1]. There are also unelided forms proving the vulgar speech to have been somewhat unsettled in this respect. Such a state of things would just suit the poet who could use either form at will, as Greek and Latin authors did with terms of uncertain quantity, and thus add a fresh element of variety to his line.

We meet with the same facility in the accentuation of compounds and words of Latin origin. Mr Omond declares the question insoluble (p. 99) in the case of *surfáce, exíle, futúre, prostráte*, etc. Yet it can be decided to a great extent not merely by an application of the well-known traditional rule of the necessary stress on the tenth counted syllable of heroic lines, but by the contemporary rhymes of such careful writers as Cowley, Dryden and later on Pope. This is recognized by the best critics and vouched for in modern editions by the addition of accents to guide the reader. Space fails me to enlarge on the subject, but will Mr Omond kindly consult the Globe edition of Dryden's poetical works where a list of differently stressed terms is given after the introduction with a reference to page and verse enabling us to judge of the accuracy of the older emphasis by means of the measure itself and the final homophony[2]? Nor can the above conclusions be called at all arbitrary. As contractions in the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries obey the philological law which enacts the disappearance of the unstressed syllable nearest the strong accent and which historically rules the passage from low Latin to old French, so too the nouns aforesaid, *surfáce, exíle*, etc., merely obey the law of the original French accentuation which gradually and hesitatingly yielded to the analogy of the Teutonic stress bearing on the earlier syllables of words. Similarly forgotten usage and the fact that *the* was at first a demonstrative explain such phrases as 'the Lord Hastings' and the slight emphasis on the article which Mr Omond, in accordance with modern custom, condemns as impossible in *P.L.*, XII, 369 and *P.R.*, IV, 633.

A few remaining points may be more summarily dismissed. The theory I expounded does not, I believe, lie open to the charge of inconsistency. My phrase 'rapidly sounded, but not counted in the line' applied to the extra unstressed syllable after the caesura which is found in the theatrical measure of *Comus* and is extremely rare in the epic. If I retain such an instance as *P.L.*, VIII, 649:

> Thy condescension, and shall be honoured ever,

it is because a clashing of four consonants in *cond'scension* would be contrary to Milton's habit of euphony. Nor did I mention abnormalities

[1] Similar contractions are frequent in the works of Milton's master Spenser, e.g., all through his *Faery Queene*.

[2] Here are a few rhymes taken from Dryden's poems: *commérce, universe; cadénce, France; essáy, pay; conventícle, stickle; perspective, live.* We find *instínct, linkt* in Butler's *Hudibras*, Part I, Can. I, l. 232, and *sheriff* (pronounced *shrieve*), *give* in Oldham's Imitation of Boileau's eighth Satire.

due to haste or negligence except in the case of a light stress on the tenth sounded syllable of the line where a heavy stress would be expected. But on the other hand I must plead guilty to speaking of an *ee* sound in *P.R.*, IV, 411 when I ought to have said: the short sound of *i* in *sit*. I was thinking just then of the distinction between the Continental *i* and the diphthongal *i* in *fine* and not of that between the *i* sounds in *feet* and *fit*. Again it is suggested (p. 100) that I shall find the burden of proof too heavy for me in reference to my statement by the way that present English poets use only feet of two or three syllables. I might perhaps appeal for indulgence in favour of *obiter dicta* that did not come within the immediate scope of my papers. But on second thoughts I still maintain the above view and would press my critic for further explanation. What indeed can a foot of four syllables be? If it implies two accents (as seems most likely from the nature of the English tongue), it resolves itself into ordinary dissyllabic feet. If it takes such forms as ´˘˘˘, ˘˘˘´, or ˘´˘˘, it might represent a pyrrhic tacked on to a trochee or an iambus. Whichever should be preferred, a sequence of three unaccented syllables is one of the rarest things in the language and would make a monstrosity of a foot so composed. On p. 101 Mr Omond has misunderstood my remark about *Comus*, l. 86:

Who with his soft pipe and smooth dittied song,

where the natural stress rests on the fifth syllable instead of the fourth. This is a violation of the iambic rhythm never perpetrated in *P.L.* or *P.R.* But such a line cannot be paralleled by *P.L.*, IV, 830:

Not to know mé argues yourselves unknown,

where the fourth syllable *is* regularly accented and where the following trochee comes after a caesura. Lastly, it may interest Mr Omond to know that my views on English metre are not only to be met with outside the Anglo-Saxon world, but that they have been partly expressed, with regard to Chaucer's poetry, by James Russell Lowell in his book entitled *My Study Windows* (London, W. Scott, undated, pp. 240–50). Lowell's linguistic attainments probably helped him to recognize the true derivation and nature of the English heroic line, the old French decasyllable[1] adopted by the author of the *Canterbury Tales* and now misnamed an iambic pentameter.

Walter Thomas.

Lyons.

[1] I may perhaps be pardoned for referring to my own study of comparative versification on this very metre in a book called *Le Décasyllabe roman et sa fortune en Europe* (Lille, Le Bigot, 1904).

Prof. Thomas argues his case with the skill and learning that might be expected. I need add only a few observations.

(1) He still prefixes the indefinite article to 'fit quantity of syllables,' which is misleading. If 'a fit number' had been meant, would not Milton have used that word? And why should he name it at all, if the number was fixed by rule? With the term 'quantity,' in its technical sense, Milton must have been quite familiar, as in Latin grammar, so in English literature; and I think that, till now, no one has doubted that it was in this sense he used the term.

(2) Fully granting that contractions were more common in Elizabethan and Jacobean speech than now, I still find lines which cannot be explained by these, and am unable to imagine how the last two vowels of 'Adria' can form a 'diphthong.' Prof. Thomas admits that some lines in *Paradise Lost* contain more than ten (counted) syllables; why not others? Neither the dicta of prosodians, nor the spellings of printers, are final proof; Milton's own spelling I have shown to be inconclusive. One line, quoted by Prof. Saintsbury, seems to put the matter almost beyond dispute, viz. (*P. L.*, IX, 1082):

> And rapture so oft beheld? Those heav'nly shapes.

Is it credible that Milton said 'And rapture soft'?

(3) The reference to music seems unfortunate, since, while the total contents of any bar equal those of its neighbours, the number of notes in any is a varying quantity. No one denies that the normal unit of Milton's verse is dissyllabic.

(4) I did not reject such accentuations as *futúre*, *exíle*, etc., but merely called them doubtful. Even in contemporary verse, the intended accentuation of words is often open to question.

(5) Though it is a side-issue, let me assure Prof. Thomas that 4-syllable feet not infrequently occur in recent trisyllabic verse, as in some of older date; and that quadruple metre has been attempted by many writers, in Australia as well as England, though secondary accent is naturally apt to obtrude itself. The objection to 'a sequence of three unaccented syllables' is not shared by poets.

T. S. Omond.

Tunbridge Wells.

The Date of 'The Chances.'

In the *Modern Language Review* of July Mr E. K. Chambers raises the question of the date of Fletcher's comedy *The Chances*, in connexion with a passage in Act iii, Sc. 1, in which the Duke of Lorraine and the Pope are mentioned. These allusions he thinks are appropriate to the year 1609 and not to any later date in Fletcher's life-time. At the same

time he admits that there is no reasonable possibility that Fletcher was acquainted with *La Señora Cornelia*, the novel of Cervantes on which the play is based, before 1613, when it was first published in Spanish; and it may be added that he probably knew it first from the French version of d'Audiguier, published in 1615.

But there is evidence in my opinion that *The Chances* belongs to a much later date than this. The prologue, as Mr Chambers is of course aware, refers to the recent death of the author:

> ingenious Fletcher made it, he
> Being in himself a perfect Comedy.
> And some sit here, I doubt not, dare aver,
> Living he made that house a theatre
> Which he pleased to frequent; and thus much we
> Could not but pay to his loved memory.

Now it seems to me from internal evidence that this prologue belongs to the first production of the play, rather than to a revival. The manner in which the play is spoken of is that which would be natural in introducing a new entertainment, and there is no reference, such as might naturally be expected, to any previous performance. It seems to me likely that both this comedy and *The Elder Brother*, the prologue of which has a somewhat similar reference, were produced on the stage after Fletcher's death, which took place in August, 1625.

As to the allusions, I do not attach much importance to them as indicating a particular date. The joke about the Pope's bulls being baited in England would be appropriate at almost any time, and not least in 1625, when the papal court was violently irritated by the European policy of Richelieu, with which the English government had definitely associated itself, after throwing over the Spanish marriage. The Duke of Lorraine played no part at all in the events of 1609, though Henry IV, whose brother-in-law he was, no doubt counted on his support. The reference to him is probably a vague one.

It may be added finally that the style of *The Chances* is like that of Fletcher's latest comedies, e.g., *The Wild-Goose Chase* and *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*; and the fact that neither *The Chances* nor *The Elder Brother* are mentioned in Herbert's office-book will not justify us in deciding that they do not belong to 1625 or 1626 until we are more assured than we are at present of the completeness of that record. The suggestion with regard to *The Elder Brother*, that it was left unfinished by Fletcher, and completed by Massinger in 1637, seems to be contradicted by the internal evidence, which points to cooperation.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

REVIEWS

The Springs of Helicon. A Study in the Progress of English Poetry from Chaucer to Milton. By J. W. MACKAIL. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 8vo. xvi + 204 pp.

The design of these six noteworthy lectures on Chaucer, Spenser, and Milton, by the Oxford Professor of Poetry, is shadowed forth in the second title. The poets are here to be studied and interpreted not in order to distil the ideas that they express; nor, again, on system and exhaustively, the less together with the greater: for these are the tasks of philosopher and historian; but as *makers*, and to serve 'the appreciation of art itself as a vital energy.' Mr Mackail holds fast to this aim, and does good work in insisting on its importance and distinctness. It is, of course, not separable from those other provinces of study; as his practice shows. For example, he judges and often condemns Spenser upon his thinking; and in skilful, but necessarily brief and incomplete notes he takes the bearings of each of the three great poets in relation to those about them. But most of his criticism is artistic in the strict sense. A fuller survey, which it may be wished that he will one day give, so as to clear up a number of pregnant passages and contestable points, would be of high value, and this instalment of it fills a special place not usurped by other living judges of poetry, few of whom are at once humanists so well-equipped, and votaries of poetry so clear-eyed, as Mr Mackail. It is well, on occasion, to concentrate on the greatest writers, as is done in this book. The chief drawback is that we forget for a moment the multitudinous population of literature, of which each individual, if alive at all, yields us something of his own unshared by the very greatest. It is like looking at the heavens on one of those nights when only the largest stars are to be seen: the host of heaven is almost forgotten. There is also some heed required when the critic, by way of exception, does touch on the place of the poets in the general movement of intellect; which, again, must never be left quite out of hearing, as it is also part of the music of the spheres. A good deal could be urged against the view that 'Milton was in full touch and full intellectual sympathy with the New Learning, with the expanding movement of the human intelligence which was absorbing and annulling the Renaissance' (p. 199). The allusions to Galileo and the new astronomy hardly bear out so large a saying, and generally we might say that Milton was pre-Baconian in his relation to

the new learning and science. But some note on the lectures themselves, unjust as it must be to their variety and what may be called their close serration, will be well.

The best are those on Chaucer. I find matter for disagreement on many a page, but must admire the Chaucerian gaiety and gusto, the finely-tempered sense of different provinces and levels in poetry, and the business-like use that is made of the fruits of Chaucerian scholarship. Throughout the purpose is steadily held in view of separating that part of Chaucer which gives him his place in the higher kingdoms of poetry from that part which is only, though decisively, kept different from prose by the fact of being put into metre. The *Complaint of Queen Anelida*, and *Troilus and Creseide*, are singled out rightly for a praise which has been heard before and must often be heard again, but which, on the lips of each new critic, does not fail of freshness,

anzi rinnuova come fa la luna.

It may be thought that praise is even too generous in one passage: 'The book of *Troilus and Creseide* is one of the few large perfect things in our literature' (p. 27). Just words, indeed, are spoken of Chaucer's Cressida; she is compared to 'some of Mr Hardy's frail, passive, wild-rose-blossom women, who, like her, without passion or strength or constancy, have but one power, to hold and break the hearts of men.'

But, after all, Chaucer's story is broken-backed, and it is just in the portraiture of Cressida, at the crisis of her fickleness, that he fails, almost with a rueful humorous consciousness of doing so. He cannot show, he can only mention, her change of faith. His psychology, as perfect in nicety as its expression is lovely, both before and after the dangerous moment, gives out just there. This is the only flaw in the great poem; all the other glories of it remain beyond criticism; and we can pardon even such a flaw, when we see its cause. Chaucer had himself fallen in love with Cressida while he drew her, and had made her so worthy of love that when he came to deal with her as the story demanded, he scrambled round that bad corner as best he might, trusting to redeem himself afterwards. I may add that I cannot join in Mr Mackail's implied reproach (as I read it) against Shakespeare for his handling of this story, and think that the indignant sentiment often spent on his play may easily become uncritical; but this theme would lead too far. It is better to note some further excellences of Mr Mackail's essay:— his useful parallel (p. 48) of the *Canterbury Tales* with *The Earthly Paradise* in respect of build and evolution; his nice remark on the 'unusual accent' of Chaucer's translation from Petrarch and of his other translation (through Boccaccio) of Dante's tercet on the unfolding flowers (p. 14); and finally the comparison of Chaucer with Shakespeare. Mr Mackail's rarest gift, it may be judged, is that of disregarding small confusing differences in the lie of the ground, and rising to the kind of plateau whence the critic can see the larger summits lying before him, in a broad and clear morning light, and in their true outlines.

A few points of difference may be set down, though hardly argued out. I cannot go with Matthew Arnold, or with Mr Mackail when he bluntly says that Wordsworth 'spoilt' the *Prioress' Tale*. In some sense he did; but his version is in a noble style if we can forget Chaucer. There is need, in view of *Filostrato* itself, and of much in the *Decameron*, to qualify the censure (p. 24) that 'heartlessness affects the whole book [*Decameron*], and the whole of Boccaccio's work.' The *Knight's Tale* Chaucer 'just succeeded in bringing to a triumphant conclusion' (p. 26). True, but the fault lies in the stuff of the story, not in its length. The *Knight's Tale* is a bad story, or at least a story (as ten Brink has well explained) on a poor level of romantic interest, and it inspires disaffection because Chaucer's execution is too great and various and splendid for such a theme. On one topic of moment Mr Mackail speaks with a divided voice; at all events, the latter end of his story is needed to supplement the beginning. This is the relationship of narrative gift to poetical gift. At first the argument is, that though Chaucer is 'the first consummate story-teller, as he still remains the best,' nevertheless 'a faculty which is more apparent in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*, which is higher in Ovid than in Virgil, which is totally or all but totally absent in some of the greatest poets, cannot be taken as a criterion of poetic quality, or as part of the essence of poetry' (p. 9).

Later, drawing an excellent parallel between the friar's diet in the *Sompnour's Tale* ('a roasted pigges head,' etc.) and Mrs Gamp's ('a little bit of pickled salmon...and a mossel of cheese'), the critic well shows that the use of metre is enough, in Chaucer's hands, to make a 'potential,' if not an actual difference, between the two passages, similar as they are in character though not in their exact bill of fare. Metre, in fact, in Coleridge's words, 'paves the way to other distinctions.' This issue is raised as part of the larger one, How much of Chaucer is really poetry? And the reader may become bewildered, unless he remembers the distinction between poetry and great or high poetry, which, in his strong enthusiasm for the latter, Mr Mackail may not always verbally distinguish. The truth is that every line which Chaucer wrote in metre *is* poetry of one kind or another, and would lose some of its incommunicable virtue if out of metre. As to story-telling—well, a story is only one of the moulds, like a lyric or a satire, into which a poet may pour his material. He may, like Scott, be a good story-teller and not so good a poet, or, like Wordsworth, a poor story-teller (in spite of his efforts) and yet a good or great poet, or he may be good in both lines, but not equally good at the same time, like Dryden. All honour to *Troilus and Creseide*; but Chaucer is greatest as a story-teller when he is ribald, or at least when high poetry is some distance off. But even here there is poetry; and I believe that Chaucer's most original, inimitable, enduring *work* is his unromantic, unliterary, homely work, whether we call it poetry or not:—the *Prologue*, the tale of Absalon, and the like, the unequalled excellence of which Mr Mackail seems to admit only with a certain reserve, but in which Chaucer's poetic and his

narrative gift are more satisfactorily fused, and for longer at a time, than anywhere else. If there is an exception to this statement, it is the *Pardoner's Tale*, where (as is well suggested on p. 65) the humour and narrative power do not stand alone, but run up into a note of savage irony, almost of terror—into the strain of the Dance of Death. For more of this, I would sacrifice, certainly most of the feminine and martyr stories, perhaps even most of the *Legend of Good Women*, with its many thin conventional notes. A protest may be added against the imputation of 'cheap sentiment' (p. 22) to Henryson's *Testament of Creseide*. The great recognition-scene in that poem has a touch of romantic dread and wistfulness exceeding anything that Chaucer conceived of the same order. But it would be graceless to end with complaint. Mr Mackail's sketch of Chaucer is the most clear-witted and affectionate one, for its scale, that has been drawn in our time, and only needs an ampler development.

The two lectures on Spenser suffer because, while much that is said in Spenser's dispraise is undeniable, the praise given is incomplete and has an air of reluctance; and if there were no more due to Spenser than this, his admitted influence on the poets would be inexplicable. It is very true that his sense of humour is weak—perhaps the 'Nine Comedies' would not have mended the fault; that he often works in thin, wavering designs, and is far from reality and life; that his ethical notions, for all their brocaded ostentation, are not the best ideas of his own time; and that in his forty and odd thousand lines of verse there are flat and dragging passages: 'the poetic imagination ebbs away, leaving only a sort of bleached rhetorical framework' (p. 110). It is also useful and sound criticism to vindicate Ariosto, who 'accepted life in a large way' (p. 99), as not only richer in humanity than Spenser, but as also—as *therefore*—sounder in his ethical instincts. It is a pity, however, that the critic, in making the comparison, should apply the doubtful, nay unsound test of suitability 'to be read aloud.' It is also partially true that 'Spenser thought (so far as he did think) in images': but only partially; for two of his *Hymns* are the first, and remain the most lucid and poetic exposition in the language of Renaissance Platonism. Whether Spenser 'thinks' in the *Hymns* is perhaps a question of words, since every one of his ideas is borrowed from Greek or Italian sources, as Miss Winstanley, in her excellent edition of these poems, has demonstrated. But the ease, the tesselating power, the many golden lines and stanzas, and above all the supreme evenness of poetic texture, raise them above all Italian or English verse on the same theme. If Spenser did not originate his ideas, or harmonise them, he is all the more representative in another way: and the truly critical presentment of Spenser, which in my own opinion has never yet been made, would involve a careful study of those alternating moods of Renaissance Platonism, pessimism, and puritanism, which the poet seems to have kept in watertight compartments in his mind, while giving to each as it came perfect—nay immortal—expression. Of *The Ruins of Time*, which tells us his intimate conviction (of the moment at least) in lofty

and impassioned form, no mention is made in these lectures. Also the general level of his style appears to be underestimated by Mr Mackail. It is not hard to pick out places where the poetical 'temperature is low.' But it is doubtful whether Spenser wrote more than a few hundred lines, out of the forty thousand, which are unpoetical. He wrote far fewer that are so, in proportion to the whole mass of his work, than any voluminous poet of his time, Shakespeare being certainly included. It is this that separates him from his time, which studied perfection of style so little, and which ranks him with Chaucer and Milton as regards mass of truly poetical writing. It is this that makes him the 'poets' poet.' There may therefore be some implication of false criticism even in the well-earned praise that is doled out to him. 'In the flowing loosely-woven texture of the poem there are many lines and stanzas, and even whole passages, which stand out from the rest in virtue of a concentration, a precision, a dignity which are the qualities of the classics' (p. 116). More generous and accurate is the tribute paid (p. 130) to the lovely episode of 'Pastorella-Perdita'; and the excellent opening sketch (pp. 73—81) of the English Renaissance makes us desire from the writer a leisurely history of English poetry, as seen from his peculiar standpoint.

Space runs out, and the two lectures on Milton cannot be outlined here. The present writer is more struck with the fissures and incongruities in Milton's mind and temper, Mr Mackail with the sacred unity of purpose which runs through his artistic life and is thus the counterpart to his moral self-dedication; and also with his singleness in desiring, and uniqueness in attaining, poetical perfection on the great scale. The two points of view, however, are by no means inconsistent, and the praise of Milton's execution is common ground. It is supported by Mr Mackail with much close analysis, of which little can here be cited. The 'progress of poesy' within Milton's own work; the survivals of his earlier in his later style; the critical lessons taught by his self-echoes and their varieties (pp. 159—161), his gradual drifting into 'a kind of poetical shorthand' (p. 187), and the character of his prosody are all brought into clear and delicate light. It may be added, in brief demur, that the phrase of Phillips about *Paradise Regained* (p. 191) is ambiguous; that the motive suggested (p. 154) for the nature of the contents of the volume of 1645 is conjectural; and that a more leisured exposition would allow of reference to the prose works (see p. 168) for their part in the growth of Milton's imagination. But Mr Mackail's book, with its severity and ardour of outlook, is a good omen for the School of English Literature at Oxford, and worthy of the author's fellow-teachers there, past and present, and for that reason, apart from its wider appeal, must claim its dues from every son of Oxford.

Oliver Elton.

Liverpool.

The Shakespeare Apocrypha. Edited, with Introduction, Notes and Bibliography, by C. F. Tucker Brooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. 8vo. lvi + 456 pp.

The plays which go to form the so-called Shakespearean Apocrypha have always received an amount of attention which, interesting as they are in themselves, would hardly have been given to them were it not for the fact that they have, at one time or another, been ascribed to Shakespeare. Yet until Mr Tucker Brooke's volume made its appearance, many of these plays were by no means readily accessible. More than half a century ago the late Professor Delius set to work upon a critical edition of the 'doubtful plays,' and what was begun by him was, after the lapse of years, continued by two other German scholars, Warnke and Proescholt. But the work has proceeded slowly and fitfully, and every student of our Elizabethan drama owes, therefore, a great debt of gratitude to Mr Brooke for giving us, what has long been desired, a critical and scholarly edition of the more important apocryphal plays within the compass of a single volume. The work reflects great credit upon its editor, and, indirectly, upon the English School at Oxford, where he has learnt his methods and ripened his critical judgment.

Fourteen plays have been chosen out of the large number of those which Elizabethan publishers, or modern critics, have associated with the name of Shakespeare; and the selection is a judicious one. The list is as follows: *Arden of Feversham*, *Locrine*, *Edward III*, *Mucedorus*, *Sir John Oldcastle*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, *The Puritan*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, *Fair Em*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *The Birth of Merlin*, *Sir Thomas More*. The editor has carefully collated the early editions of each of these plays; and, in the case of *Sir Thomas More*, he has had before him the peculiarly interesting MS. of the play, preserved in the Harleian collection, and first edited by Dyce in 1844. Mr Brooke keeps throughout to the old spelling, and furnishes us with a text which is, as near as possible, that of the original quartos. One may perhaps wish that the Delegates of the Clarendon Press had seen their way to issue the volume in a more generous form, on better paper and with clearer type; but, on the other hand, much has been gained by the publication of the work at a price which is within the range of every student of dramatic literature.

In his Introduction (pp. i—lvi), Mr Brooke presents in a lucid manner the literary history of each of the fourteen plays, and treats the question of Shakespearean authorship sanely and judiciously. He is prepared to accept Shakespeare's handiwork in the insurrection scene in *Sir Thomas More*, is sceptical of his share in either *Edward III* or *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and still more so in the case of the other eleven plays. Though the present reviewer is unconvinced that Shakespeare had anything to do with *Sir Thomas More*, the presentation of the case

by Mr Brooke is throughout admirable; and no less admirable are the arguments for the ascription of *The Puritan* to Thomas Middleton. The editor has formed, we think, too low an estimate of the dramatic quality of the Countess of Salisbury episode in *Edward III*; and, in quoting J. A. Symonds' view as to the relation of that episode to Bandello's prose version of it, he fails to recognise the masterly transformation of the story by the dramatist, a transformation which, if not Shakespearean, is worthy of Shakespeare.

Mr Brooke has spent much time and thought on the investigation of the sources of the doubtful plays, and though he has not brought much fresh material to light, he has presented his theme in a clear and scholarly manner. In the case of a few plays, however, this part of the Introduction is not as full as it might have been; and in the hope that Mr Brooke may before long be called upon to produce a second edition of his valuable work, we venture to draw his attention to one or two *lacunae*. In dealing with *Fair Em*, he has omitted all reference to the ballad, entitled *The Miller's Daughter of Manchester*, which was entered upon the Stationers' Register in the year 1581, and is the probable source of that portion of the play which furnishes it with its title. Nor, in referring to the sources of *The Merry Devil*, does he mention the poem, *Fabyl's Ghost*, which is now lost, but was known to Thomas Warton and the poet Collins. In discussing the literary history of *The Birth of Merlin*, reference should have been made to Middleton's *Mayor of Queenborough*, of which the Merlin play is both a sequel and an imitation; and, finally, in dealing with *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, notice should have been taken of the fact that there appeared about the same time another dramatisation of the story, viz., George Wilkins' *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*.

The Notes to the plays, though brief, show wide erudition; and the highest praise is due to Mr Brooke for furnishing his volume with a very complete Bibliography: in this he records all known editions of the various plays, and the translations of them into foreign languages, and presents a vast array of critical studies of the subject.

F. W. Moorman.

Leeds.

A Contribution to the Study of Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-names. By R. E. Zachrisson. Lund, 1909. xvi + 171 pp.

This is certainly the most important publication upon the history of English place-names in general that has yet appeared. The number of examples of places dealt with is over 700; and no one can in future neglect this source of information, on account of the value of the numerous phonetic changes that are here explained, for the most part with much success.

It is impossible to give here an adequate account of the contents or

of the abundance of illustration. It will be best to take just one or two examples in which the author has added to our previous knowledge.

In dealing with the place-names of Hertfordshire, the present writer was unable to give any satisfactory origin of the place-name Tring. The solution offered by Mr Zachrisson is new, and I believe it to be quite right. He first of all calls attention to the fact, mentioned in Bardsley's *Dictionary of English Surnames*, that it is a mere variant of Thring. It will easily be seen that Tring is a Norman form of Thring, just as Torp is a Norman spelling of Thorp. Next it is noted that, amongst the various old spellings already given by me, I have missed one of much importance, viz., the form Tredunga in Domesday Book, which also gives the forms Trevinga and Treunga. It must be observed that *e* often appears, in Norman, in place of the English *i*; and it becomes clear, when all the evidence is considered, that Tredunga and Trevinga are to be connected with the Domesday spellings Nortreding, Sud-treding, Wes-tredinge, which have reference, respectively, to the North Riding, South Riding, and West Riding of Yorkshire. But this Riding is well-known to be a late substitution for Thriding or Thrithing, meaning 'a third part of a shire.' In other words, both Thring and Tring are contracted forms of Thrithing, due to the difficulty which the Normans found in pronouncing the English *th* between two vowels; as exemplified, for instance, in their reduction of Æthelmær and Æthelwine to Aylmer and Aylwin. In connexion with this, the account of the form *trehing*, in Bosworth and Toller, may be consulted. This is the form which the same word assumes in the recorded Laws of Edward the Confessor.

The author makes an excellent point by proving clearly that the name of Grantchester is little better than a late blunder. The old name was certainly Grante-seta, Grante-sete (Domesday), representing an A. S. Grantan-sætan, i.e., 'settlers beside the Granta'; where the suffix is the same as in Dorset and Somerset. Later forms were Gransete, Grancete, which were turned into Grancester after 1300, and we find the spelling Grauncester as late as 1572. I have even found the singular form Graundcetour as late as 1587. The old form should have become Granset; but, as the suffix *-set* was not commonly understood, it was mistaken for *-cester*; and, as this was a known variant of *-chester*, the name was boldly exchanged for that of Grant-chester, which was an old name indeed, only it meant Cambridge! As to the latter point, there can be no doubt, when the evidence is considered. It is quite true that the old form of Cambridge was Granta-bridge, or, in the A.S. form, Grantan-brycg; but it is equally clear that it sometimes bore also the alternative name of Grant-chester, or (in the spelling of Beda) Grantacæstir. All doubt on the subject disappears when we find that Grancestria was used for the name of the *county* as well as of the town. Examples are: 'in provincia Grantaceaster,' Birch's *Charters*, 1266; 'in comitatu Grantecestriae,' Kemble, 907; and in Gaimar's *Chronicle*, 1605, *la meitè de Grantcestre* means 'the half of Cambridgeshire.' The clearest example is in Henry of Huntingdon, *Mon. Brit.*

692: 'Kairgrant, id est Grantecastria, que modo dicitur Cantebrigia.' It follows that we must look for the site of the old Roman town at Cambridge itself, and not at Grantchester; which is what our antiquaries (as I suppose) practically do.

I do not know why the author, at p. 81, repeats the old identification of Cambridge with 'the Roman Camboricum,' or rather, Camboritum. I have pointed out once before that this identification was one of Camden's guesses; and he was guided by the apparent similarity of the names, actually confusing the fourteenth century Cam- (which was a broken-down form of Granta) with the British Cambo-, which seems to have meant 'crooked'; and further (by misdivision) confusing *-boritum* with the modern English *bridge*; whereas the suffix *-ritum*, W. *rhyd*, signifies 'a ford,' or a place where no bridge exists. Those who propose to identify Cambridge with Camboritum must have something better to go upon than the delusive 'similarity' in the sound of the names.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

Dante's Convivio. Translated into English, by W. W. JACKSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 12mo. 318 pp.

The *Convivio*, Dante's longest prose work, has had a somewhat chequered fate. It was first printed at Florence in 1490, only eighteen years later than the *editio princeps* of the *Divina Commedia*, and more than eighty years before the appearance of the first printed edition (Florence, 1576) of the *Vita Nuova*. At the beginning of the sixteenth century it was three times reprinted at Venice within the space of ten years (in 1521, 1529, and 1531), after which no other edition was issued for nearly two hundred years (1723). Not till the beginning of the nineteenth century was the interest in the treatise revived, when three more or less so-called critical editions were published in Italy within a few years of each other, at Milan (1826), Padua (1827), and Modena (1831), respectively. The first really critical edition of the text, by a scholar who recognised that the authority of the MSS. must not lightly be disregarded, as it had been by previous editors, was that published by Dr Moore in 1894 in the Oxford edition of the complete works of Dante. This text was reissued ten years later in the third edition of the Oxford Dante, in a greatly improved form, Dr Moore having in the interval collated the most obscure passages in all the known MSS. (to the number of thirty-three), with the result that he has been able to produce, if not a final, at any rate a very fairly satisfactory text of what had hitherto been the most corrupt and mutilated of all Dante's works.

The earliest translations of the *Convivio* were the German version by Kannegiesser, and the French by Cesena, published respectively in 1845 and 1852. The first English translation, by Miss Sayer, did not

appear until 1887. This, an unsatisfactory performance, was followed in 1889 by Miss Hillard's version, the style of which is graceful, but which not seldom wholly misrepresents the meaning of the original. In 1903 a third English version was published by Mr Wicksteed, who as a Dantist of many years' standing was in a position to rectify many of the blunders of his predecessors. Mr Wicksteed's translation, however, owing to its uncompromising literalness, is singularly bald and unattractive in style, while the rendering itself is not always unimpeachable. Consequently the announcement of a new translation from the hand of a scholar and translator of repute, who was known to have been engaged upon the task for several years in the intervals of more pressing work, was welcome news to students of Dante. Dr Jackson in his preface renders a graceful tribute to the labours of previous translators, especially to the German version of Kannegiesser, which he justly eulogises on account of its 'insight into the meaning, and its success in conveying a general impression of the original.' Dr Jackson's own version will appeal to all who appreciate good English. As a translation it is faithful without being servile, and it is full of happy renderings of words and phrases which have been stumbling-blocks to his predecessors.

Dr Jackson has naturally followed the best available text, that of the Oxford Dante, but he has not been content to accept it blindly. This is evident from the fact that he has proposed (and introduced in his translation) several important emendations, which we are glad to know have the approval of Dr Moore—a sufficient guarantee of their soundness. None of these involves violent changes, indeed some of them are merely changes of punctuation, but they are none the less important on that score, inasmuch as they substitute sense for nonsense in passages which have hitherto baffled both editors and commentators. An excellent example of this kind of emendation, which has the additional merit of restoring the reading of the MSS., will be found in a passage in the fourteenth chapter of the fourth book, in which the following sentence occurs: 'in loro generazione di nobiltà essere non può.' Owing to a misunderstanding of this sentence, involved in taking the words 'in loro generazione' together, Fraticelli and others were led to alter the MS. reading by omitting *di* before *nobiltà*. Dr Jackson, however, by punctuating 'in loro, generazione di nobiltà essere non può' at once makes the meaning plain and solves the difficulty, without tampering with the text. On the other hand, we have noticed one or two places where corrections made in the last edition of the Oxford text have been overlooked (e.g., in the third chapter of the second book, line 62, where the translation renders 'essendo mezza' instead of 'essendo nuova'; and in the sixth chapter of the same book, line 24, where it renders 'tredici anni' instead of 'quattordici anni'); and one passage (in the twenty-fourth chapter of the fourth book, line 47) in which an emendation (*mesi* for *anni*), which is undoubtedly right, has been introduced *sub silentio*.

Prefixed to the translation is a brief introductory essay, which deals with the relations of the *Convivio* to the *Vita Nuova* and *Commedia*,

and contains a summary but sufficient account of the scholastic philosophy of Dante's day. As Dr Jackson observes, some knowledge of the *Convivio* is indispensable for every one who desires to trace the development of Dante's genius, or to understand his relation to the thought and literature of his age. The object of the treatise, which was 'a layman's book,' is well defined—'it was intended to bring the highest teaching concerning the principles which regulate human conduct in public and private life, as well as a mass of knowledge about the constitution of human nature and of the world, within reach of all who were fitted to receive it.' A very full 'summary of contents' is prefixed to each book of the treatise, which will be of great assistance to students, especially to those who approach the work for the first time, as Dante's numerous digressions make it difficult at times to follow the thread of his argument. A few notes, dealing chiefly with the translator's emendations of the text, are appended, together with a very useful 'index of subject-matter,' the first serious attempt of the kind, which does not include names of persons, or of works cited, or technical terms, but is intended to supply references to the principal thoughts and philosophic opinions expressed in the treatise. It is to be hoped that this scholarly translation, which will assuredly take its place as the standard English version of the *Convivio,* may be followed by similar translations of the rest of the prose works of Dante, none of the existing versions, not even Rossetti's well-known rendering of the *Vita Nuova,* being wholly satisfactory from the point of view of scholarship, and in the light of the most recent textual criticism.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

BURNHAM, BUCKS.

Dante's Divina Commedia: Vol. I. *Inferno.* Edited and annotated by C. H. GRANDGENT. London: D. C. Heath & Co. Cr. 8vo. xxxvi + 283 pp.

This annotated edition of the Italian text of the *Divina Commedia,* by the Professor of Romance Languages in Harvard University, of which the present volume is the first instalment, 'is intended primarily for the general literary public, though adapted also to academic use.' The editor's aim has been to make it 'so complete that readers will need for the comprehension of the poem no other book save their dictionary.' The notes, which lay no claim to originality, are very largely a compilation from the well-known Italian commentary of Francesco Torraca, which was published four years ago. The editor's 'particular debt' to Torraca is acknowledged in the preface, and a list of other works utilised or referred to is given at the beginning of the volume. It is presumably by an oversight that no mention is made in this list of the present writer's *Dante Dictionary,* which has evidently been laid under contribution pretty frequently. This omission is the more curious inasmuch as at the end of the introduction the work is

recommended among 'volumes of general studies' as 'most useful for reference.' It may be observed that the editions quoted in this list are not always the latest available. For instance, the reader is referred to the fourth edition, published in 1899, of Casini's commentary on the *Commedia*, whereas a fifth and greatly improved edition of this excellent work was issued in 1903.

In his introduction, which is well-written, Professor Grandgent gives a brief sketch of Dante's life, and an estimate of the man and of his work. This account, which is based on the most recent authorities, is in the main accurate, but some of the biographical data appear to be unnecessarily vague. For example, it is stated that Gemma Donati bore Dante two sons, 'and, in all likelihood, two daughters.' The existence of two daughters, Antonia and Beatrice, is attested by documentary evidence. Again, the date of Dante's death is given as 'September 13 or 14.' It is true that in the epitaph ascribed to Giovanni del Virgilio the poet is said to have departed this life 'Septembris idibus'; but the accepted date is that given by Boccaccio in his *Vita di Dante* ('del mese di Settembre negli anni di Cristo 1321, nel dì che la esaltazione della Santa Croce si celebra dalla Chiesa,' i.e., September 14), and repeated in his *Comento sopra la Commedia* ('assai ne consta Dante essere morto negli anni di Cristo 1321 il dì 14 di Settembre'). The phraseology of the notes is not always happy. Such sentences as 'she had them drown the sound with noise' (p. 119), and 'Constantine was thought to have donated etc.,' are needlessly clumsy; while 'an elaborate system of computation by epicycles,' in the explanation of the Ptolemaic system (p. 3), is not very illuminating to the uninstructed. Further, 'bird-hunting' (more than once) is hardly a recognised term for falconry or hawking. The editor has allowed himself occasionally to be misled by Torraca's comment. In a note on *Inferno* v, 48 he writes (on the strength of Torraca's '*traendo guai*: frequentissimo'): 'Dante was exceedingly fond of the expression *trarre guai*.' As a matter of fact Dante only uses the expression four times in the whole range of his works, viz. twice in the *Commedia* and twice in the *Vita Nuova*. The volume for the most part is printed with care, but a few misprints have escaped notice, e.g., 'Via Nuova' (p. viii); 'Plumtre' (p. xxxiv); 'Gan Gemignano' (p. xi); '1233' for 1333 (p. 113); and 'vulto,' 'comitatu' (for 'comitate'), and 'sospites' (for 'hospites') in the quotation from Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* on p. 137.

On the whole the editor's scheme, which includes expository arguments to each canto, is well carried out, and if the two succeeding volumes are up to the same level the work will no doubt be welcome to a certain class of English readers of the *Commedia*; but in view of the fact that Torraca's and Casini's admirable and exhaustive commentaries, together with the whole text of the poem, may be procured for three or four francs apiece, we feel impelled to ask what can be the *raison d'être* of an expensive publication like the present (costing fifteen shillings for the three parts), which avowedly supplies only a minimum of editorial matter, the whole of which in the present volume,

apart from the Italian text, might on a liberal computation be contained within the compass of some eighty pages of the same format. We cannot help thinking that a single volume of notes etc., without the Italian text, which is available in numerous cheap reprints nowadays, would have been more acceptable to the generality of readers and students of Dante's poem.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

BURNHAM, BUCKS.

Molière. Par EUGÈNE RIGAL. Paris: Hachette et C^ie^, 1908. 2 vols. 8vo. vii + 308 and 333 pp.

Molière (Les Grands Écrivains Français). Par GEORGES LAFENESTRE. Paris: Hachette et C^ie^, 1909. 8vo. 202 pp.

Since *Le Moliériste* came to an end in 1889 comparatively little has been written on Molière in France, and there has been no new book dealing with his life and work as a whole. These two publications by Hachette are therefore especially welcome. Widely though they differ in range and scope, they have this in common, that they have both a full share of that common-sense which George Meredith in his delightful *Essay on Comedy* declares to be essential to the comic spirit. M. Rigal's book, which is the outcome of lectures delivered at the University of Montpellier, takes the form of a chronological study of Molière's career, and includes a careful analysis of all his plays, and a considerable amount of quotation. M. Rigal is especially to be commended for his thorough appreciation of Molière's faculty for laughter. He recognises that he was a master of the whole gamut of comedy, from the loud, boisterous tones of *M. de Pourceaugnac* and *Les Fourberies de Scapin* to the gentle laughter of *Le Misanthrope*, which by reason of its delicacy has escaped the notice of some critics. It is true that Molière's view of life was serious at bottom, and sometimes even gloomy. Yet none the less he laughed at the world. He laughed alike at Alceste whom he loved, and Tartuffe whom he loathed, and at Arnolphe whom he pitied. There is nothing paradoxical in this. Ridicule is compatible with love and hate, with sympathy and indignation, and with many deep and serious emotions. Molière saw the tragic side of things as well as the comic. But his genius was comic; he was a comic writer and a comic actor. So he merely hints at the tragedy of life, while it is the comedy which stirs his imagination. M. Rigal finds the starting-point of Molière's dramatic art in the farce, and if he sometimes presses this idea too hard, he is right in the main. For the mediæval farce contained the germ of social satire. Jodelle was on the right track in *Eugène*, and it was a pity that his successors were diverted from it by the influence of Italian comedy. *Les Précieuses ridicules* is farce writ large, and like *Patelin* shows the capability of farce in the hands of a man of genius. Molière owed something too to the Italians, but more to their *commedia dell' arte* than to their regular written comedy. It was from the former that he learnt the importance of

gesture and movement, of comedy in action as well as in speech. With what success he learnt it may be best seen in some of his latest plays, in *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, in *Les Fourberies de Scapin*, and in *Le Malade imaginaire*. M. Rigal rightly insists on the fact that Alceste and Tartuffe and Arnolphe are *au fond* comic characters. He might have added that even Don Juan has his ridiculous side. For his readiness to fall in love reaches the point of absurdity, and he cuts a ridiculous figure between Charlotte and Mathurine.

On the question of how far Molière portrays himself in his work M. Rigal is thoroughly sound (c. I, and esp. pp. 1—5). Though Molière as an artist is purely objective, he was extremely sensitive as a man. His comedies therefore reflect in a general way the phases of his life. The emotion which inspired them was the result not only of the contemplation of social evils, but sometimes also of his own personal troubles. He conceived *Le Misanthrope* in a misanthropic humour, but the idea once engendered, the comic artist that was in him took in hand the work of creation. Alceste is no more Molière than Hamlet is Shakespeare.

Like Brunetière and M. Lavisse, M. Rigal is unduly severe on Molière's character and morality. On this point the judgment of M. Lafenestre is more favourable and more just. He speaks of Molière's *santé morale*; he insists as against Brunetière on his sincerity in claiming a moral aim for his more serious comedies, and he is excellent on the purport of *Tartuffe* and *Don Juan*, which Brunetière, blinded by prejudice, has so completely misunderstood. In his account of Molière's life, which is necessarily brief, but which brings out all the important points, he mentions Molière's marriage without any reference to the scandal about Armande's parentage. This is the proper way of treating it. M. Rigal does not realise how worthless the evidence is for the supposition that Armande was Madeleine's daughter. Moreover after speaking on one page of 'a current opinion in the seventeenth century,' he changes this on the next to 'the opinion of the seventeenth century,' which it most certainly was not.

On Molière's faculty for laughter M. Lafenestre has an eloquent passage (p. 115), and he effectively answers the accusation sometimes brought against him that his characters are abstract types rather than realities. There rise in protest not only great figures like Alceste and Tartuffe and Don Juan and Célimène, but a crowd of minor characters who, as M. Lafenestre says, 'become alive the moment they appear on the stage.' As in all great creative writers, this illusion of life is partly the effect of style. Whatever faults may be detected in Molière's style by pedants and purists, all who have had any experience of the stage are unanimous in their testimony that no dramatic style—M. Lafenestre on this point happily quotes Sarcey—was ever more natural, more effective, more potent to convey to the reader or the spectator an impression of reality and life.

A. Tilley.

Cambridge.

Bürgers Gedichte in zwei Teilen. Herausgegeben mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen von ERNST CONSENTIUS. Berlin, Bong und Co. 1909. 8vo. cxxxii + 248 + 367 pp.

Mit Freuden schick ich mich an, diese neue Bürgerausgabe zu besprechen. Der Gesamteindruck ist ein durchaus günstiger. Obgleich die Ausgaben von Sauer und Berger völlig genügen in dem Sinne, dass sie uns das zur Erkenntnis von Bürgers dichterischer Eigenart notwendige Material in die Hand geben, fernere Ausgaben also das Gesamtbild von Bürgers poetischer Tätigkeit nie werden modificieren können: so bleibt diesen immerhin die dankbare Aufgabe, das seit dem Erscheinen ihrer Vorgängerinnen ans Licht oder wieder ans Licht getretene Material zu sammeln und es in das Werk einzufügen, sei's auch nur um vor den Augen jener bibliographischen Kleinkrämer Gnade zu finden, die sich alles gefallen lassen, nur nicht das Auslassen des unbedeutendsten Stammbuchsblatts.

So finden wir bei Consentius nicht weniger als neunzehn neue Stücke, die von Bürger sind oder von ihm sein sollen, zusammen etwa 400 Verse, und im Anhang weitere vier mit über hundert Versen. In diesen Anhang aber hätten *alle* die Stücke aufgenommen werden sollen, die nicht *zweifellos* als Bürgerisch bezeugt sind. Ich denke da besonders an die beiden Festgedichte für den Herzog von Gloucester (S. 103) und Georg III (S. 107), deren Aufnahme Seite bei Seite mit den Oden an die englischen Prinzen und an den Herzog von York allerdings für den sehr naheliegt, der von ihrem Bürgerischen Ursprung durchdrungen ist. Ich aber gebe nicht mehr zu als: sie *können* von Bürger sein, weil wir sie einem andern nicht mit Sicherheit zuschreiben dürfen. Das ist recht wenig: aber mehr beweisen weder Ebsteins noch Consentius' Ausführungen. Es stehen ihnen sogar gewichtige Bedenken entgegen.

Die Ode an Gloucester könne nicht von Gotter sein, sagt Ebstein (*Hannoverland*, 1907, Juliheft), weil dieser 'in Redlichs *Chiffernlexicon* nicht mit "G-r" (so ist das Gedicht bei seinem zweiten Abdruck, in den *Unterhaltungen* unterzeichnet) aufträte.' So etwas zu sagen ist doch recht bedenklich; hat denn Redlichs Arbeit die Bedeutung einer Quelle oder eines Dokumentes? Nicht einmal als Untersuchung ist sie unanfechtbar. Man erwartet nun aber, dass Bürger als 'G-r' bei Redlich auftrete. Nichts davon! Was haben weiter die Chiffernverhältnisse des *Göttinger Almanachs*—der *Vossische*, der für 1776 zum ersten Male ausgegeben wurde, scheidet ganz aus—mit denen der *Unterhaltungen* zu tun? Ich lasse es bis auf weiteres dahingestellt, ob nun wirklich Gotter der Verfasser ist, oder Bürger, oder irgend jemand anders, der Herausgeber der *Hamburger Unterhaltungen* hat ihn vielleicht selbst nur vermutet: unter keinen Umständen durfte sich Ebstein auf jenen Brief Bürgers an Kästner stützen, in dem er von seiner Ode auf den Herzog von Gloucester spricht, ohne einwandsfrei nachzuweisen oder wenigstens wahrscheinlich zu machen, dass es wirklich

dies Gedicht ist, auf das die des Briefes Angaben zutreffen. Er hätte auseinandersetzen müssen, inwiefern das Gedicht nun eine 'Fiktion' ist, in dem Sinne wie Waller das Wort dem englischen König gegenüber braucht und Bürger es Kästnern gegenüber citiert. Viel wichtiger als die Notizen über Waller und die Vermutung über Bürgers Bekanntschaft mit ihm, die man doch nicht mit dem Satz 'dass Waller's Oden Bürger als Vorbild für diese "Fiktion" gedient haben können, scheint mir nicht unwahrscheinlich' nachweisen kann, wäre es in diesem Zusammenhange gewesen, nachzuweisen, woher Bürger die Anekdote kannte! Verstehe ich sie richtig, so enthält sie eine Schmeichelei für Karl II: 'für das Mindergutgeraten der Lobeshymnen, die Du erhältst, mag Dich das Bewusstsein trösten, dass sie von mir ehrlich gemeint, von Dir also verdient sind; die Cromwell bekommt, mögen als Gedichte mitunter besser sein, dafür aber sind sie nicht ernst gemeint; er hat sie nicht verdient.' Das englische Wortspiel könnten wir etwa mit 'gedichtet—erdichtet' wiedergeben. Von der Anwendung des Ausdrucks 'Fiktion' auf das angeblich von Bürger gelieferte Gedicht hat also die Untersuchung in jedem Fall auszugehn. Man müsste denn annehmen, dass Bürger, nur um mit literarischen Kenntnissen zu prunken, den gewandten Causeur zu spielen, oder aus ähnlichen äusserlichen Gründen (Ebstein setzt das Gedicht ja auch in Bürger's Renommierjahre), das Geschichtchen erzähle, seinen Fall mit dem andern gar nicht voll verglichen, ja nicht einmal den Schluss wirklich gezogen haben wolle, der doch nahegelegt wird: dass sein Gedicht auch gut und er darum ebenfalls ein Poet sei; dass er vielmehr weiter nichts als den Begriff 'Poet' gewinnen wolle, um sich als solcher vorzustellen; und dass er das Wort 'Fiktion' einfach brauche im Sinne von 'Ode auf jemanden, die doch dem Betreffenden gar nicht zu Gesicht kommen wird'—vielleicht in der heimlichen Hoffnung, dass sie für würdig befunden werden möge, *mehr* als Fiktion zu werden, d.h. als wirkliche Festode zu dienen und dem Angedichteten überreicht zu werden. Oder man könnte sagen: mit dem Ausdruck 'Fiktion' und dem Hinweis auf jene Anekdote beuge Bürger sehr gewandt den skeptischen Bemerkungen vor, deren er sich gerade von Seiten des ironischen Kästner hätte versehen müssen, und mit dem selbstironisirenden 'ohne Zweifel also mir auch' dem Vergleich, zu dem wiederum der Hinweis auf die Anekdote herausfordern musste, dem Vergleich zwischen dem bekannten und anerkannten Hofdichter Waller und dem homo ignotus und Studiosen Gottfried August Bürger aus Molmerschwende. Zu dem Epitheton 'garstig' aber, das hier in Wirklichkeit nicht mehr sein *könne* und in Wahrheit auch nicht mehr heissen *solle* als 'im Ausdruck verfehlt,' greife Bürger in unterwürfigem Erinnern an die vielen tadelnden Bemerkungen, die sein ganzes Auftreten, vor allem aber seine burschikose Ausdrucksweise, zumal von Seiten der Mitglieder der Deutschen Gesellschaft, hervorgerufen hatten[1]. Kurz das Gedicht sei nicht als das anzusehen was die Eingangsphrase des Briefs 'nur pour

[1] Vgl. z. B. die Randbemerkungen derselben zu Bürgers Aufnahmeschrift, *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, XII (1884), 70 ff.

passer le tems' glauben machen wolle, sondern als eine in voller Absicht und zu ganz bestimmtem Zweck unternommene Arbeit, und die legere Haltung, in der Bürger eingangs des Briefes auftrete, als eine natürlich scheinen sollende, in Wirklichkeit aber genau einstudierte Pose. Auch in seinem spätern Leben habe Bürger noch häufig solche streberhaften Einfälle gehabt.—Ich überlasse es den Kennern Bürgers, zwischen diesen Einwänden und der folgenden, weniger gewundenen, Überlegung zu entscheiden. Nehmen wir wiederum an, das Gedicht sei mit dem in dem Briefe erwähnten identisch, dann ergäbe sich folgender Tatbestand: Bürger setzt die beiden Brüder, den Herzog und den König, in Verhältnisse hinein, dichtet ihnen Eigenschaften an, weist ihnen Verdienste zu, die entweder lediglich seiner Phantasie entstammen oder von denen er direkt weiss, dass sie nicht vorhanden sind, oder sogar, dass sie den tatsächlich vorhandenen entgegengesetzt sind. Die beiden letzten Möglichkeiten nun scheiden von vornherein aus; historisch richtig, wenn auch nach höfischer Manier etwas übertrieben, ist der Hinweis auf die schwierigen politischen Verhältnisse, unter denen Georg III den Thron bestiegen, auf die Verdienste, die er sich um die Pacificierung Europas im Pariser und Hubertusburger Frieden erworben, auf die Unterstützung, die er seitdem Künsten und Wissenschaften in England wie in Hannover hatte angedeihen lassen; den Tatsachen von Anbeginn entspricht ferner das enge brüderliche Verhältnis, wie es im Gedichte als zwischen dem Könige und Gloucester bestehend dargestellt wird, und die Abneigung des ersteren gegen die persönliche Teilnahme an kriegerischen Unternehmungen. Hier wird auch nichts behauptet, das dem widerspricht, was Bürger 1769 von den beiden Fürsten *wissen konnte*, worauf, wie man mir erwidern könnte, es allein ankomme. Dagegen ist das, was in einigen Versen über die zukünftige Bestimmung des jungen Herzogs bemerkt wird, allerdings eitel Fiktion, Phantasiegebilde, auch durch die Geschichte später noch in schärferem Sinne als Fiktion erwiesen. Indessen sieht man sofort, dass es sich hier ebenfalls um nichts mehr, als eine harmlose Ausmalung und Ausdeutung des bestehenden tatsächlichen Verhältnisses handelt, eine Erinnerung an das bekannte Kulturbild, wo der eine den Pflug führt, indessen der andere mit dem Schwerte die Arbeit schützt. Man wird zugeben: es ist recht unwahrscheinlich, dass sich Bürger's Worte auf dies Gedicht bezogen haben, recht unwahrscheinlich, dass er ein solches Werk überhaupt mit dem leichtfertigen Signum 'Fiktion' versehen habe.

Noch grössere Bedenken habe ich gegen die Aufnahme des andern Festgedichts unter die unzweifelhaft Bürgerischen Stücke. Sicherlich hat ja Consentius Recht, auf seine intime Verwandtschaft mit dem *Hohen Liede* hinzuweisen. Und weit mehr noch als die Ähnlichkeit im Versmass, in der Reimverschlingung und in der Strophenform, auf die er hinweist, fallen für diese Verwandtschaft die innern Ähnlichkeiten ins Gewicht. Man vergleiche, um nur einige zu erwähnen, die erste Strophe des *Festgedichts* (FG) mit den Versen 9 f. 21 ff. 56 ff. 231 ff. 321 ff. des *Hohen Lieds* (HL); oder FG vss 61–80 mit HL 41–50;

FG Strr. 2–7 mit HL vss 51 ff.; FG vss 89 f. mit HL 40; FG 107 ff. mit HL 31 ff.; FG 171 mit HL 109; FG 116 ff. mit HL 131 ff.; FG 123 mit HL 284; die Reime düften—klüften—grüften in den ersten Versen des FG mit duft—gruft—luft HL 6 ff. und 270 ff.; bogen—wogen—gezogen FG 61 ff. mit HL 31 ff.; geschmückt—entzückt—beglückt FG 117 ff. und 37 ff. mit HL 132 ff.; FG 101 ff. mit HL 41 ff.; FG 107 ff. mit HL 272 ff. u.s.w. Solche Ähnlichkeiten aber machen es für mich so gut wie sicher, dass Bürger *nicht* der Verfasser war. Er hat nie sich selbst nachgedichtet: auf den Eindruck, den eine Imitation der eignen Manier den Verehrern und Kennern seiner Muse gemacht hätte, braucht darum gar nicht hingewiesen zu werden. Und denkt man an alles, was er selbst in jener Zeit über sein Gedicht gesagt hat, an die schmerzlichstolzen Worte, mit denen er die Freunde auf seinen 'liebsten, seinen teuersten Gesang, sein Meisterstück' aufmerksam macht, an die Schlussstrophe des *Hohen Liedes* selbst, an die gänzliche Gleichgültigkeit, ja Abneigung, mit der Bürger von jeher allem höfischen Wesen gegenüberstand, vor allem aber an seine Stimmung der Universität und dem Hofe gegenüber gerade zu jener Zeit, an seine Absicht, Göttingen je eher je lieber den Rücken zu kehren; so wird man meinem starken Zweifel an Bürgers Autorschaft zustimmen. Zudem war Bürger, wie Consentius selbst angibt, im Mai 1789 gar nicht in Göttingen, er war in grösster Eile am 20sten oder 21sten April, dem Tage, wo er das erste frische Exemplar der neuen Ausgabe seiner Gedichte in der Hand gehabt und das Gedicht an Althoff fertiggemacht hatte, hinweggeeilt. In den Gedichtkladden, die gerade für jene Zeit von höchster biographischer Wichtigkeit sind, findet sich auch nicht eine Spur dieses grossen Gedichts. Auf der Reise kann es, wie an andrer Stelle nachgewiesen werden soll, kaum entstanden sein. Mit dem Hinweis auf die Zahl der Teilnehmer an der Feier—in Wirklichkeit kennt man die gar nicht, und die geringe Zahl der dem gedruckten Gedichte angehängten Namen, 128, lässt eher auf das Gegenteil schliessen—kann man doch kaum wahrscheinlich machen, dass die Feier seit langem vorbereitet gewesen sei. Zudem lauteten die Nachrichten über des Königs Befinden bis weit ins Jahr 1789 hinein durchaus nicht so, dass man auf eine völlige Genesung auch nur hätte rechnen können—dem gegenüber die Nachricht von einer momentanen Besserung im December 1788 wenig besagen will. Vor allem aber fällt auf, dass Bürger des Gedichts nirgends erwähnt, nirgends es wieder abdruckt, nicht in den Musenalmanachen, für die er Material sehr gut brauchen konnte, noch sonstwo; dass er es nicht für die dritte Gedichtausgabe bestimmt: und das alles, obgleich er sich seiner viel weniger hätte zu schämen brauchen als mancher andern Gedichte und der Festoden, die er wiederholt zum Abdruck brachte. Ich glaube fest an Schlegels Verfasserschaft. Verstand es einer, Bürger nachzuahmen, so war er's. Man denke doch an seine Oden aus dem Jahre 1789, an Bürgers eigne Worte über diesen poetischen Sohn, an die verständnisvolle Würdigung des *Hohen Liedes*, ermöglicht durch sein eminent nachempfindendes und nachschaffendes Talent und seinen

im intimsten geistigen Verkehr mit Bürger gewonnenen Einblick in dessen Arbeitsweise. Schlegel habe, sagt der Herausgeber, bei der Besprechung des *Hohen Liedes* auf das *Individuelle* des Versmasses hingewiesen; wer den Schlegel jener Zeit genau kennt, wird ihm die Nachahmung desselben um so eher zutrauen! Wohl aber ist es möglich, dass Bürger allen als der Verfasser gegolten hat, ja dass Schlegel dies gar bezweckt hatte: trat er doch als sein dichterischer und persönlicher Anwalt auch noch bei andern Gelegenheiten während Bürgers langer Abwesenheit auf. Wer weiss denn, ob nicht der junge Mann dem verehrten älteren Freunde einen Dienst erweisen wollte? denn ohne Zweifel waren um die Prinzen gewisse Autoritäten versammelt. Tatsache ist doch, dass Bürger bald (September) nach seiner Rückkehr (Juli) zum Professor ernannt wurde und sich dann in den devotesten Ausdrücken bei den Hannoverischen Decernenten bedankte. Und weiter Tatsache, dass Schlegel durch seinen Vater mit diesen in Fühlung stand.

Die schöne Bäckerin list nicht aufgenommen: der jüngst[1] gelieferte Nachweis, sie sei von Becker, nicht von Bürger, entscheidet fast mit Sicherheit. Wie bezeichnend aber, dass alle Welt sofort auf Bürger als Verfasser gekommen war. Ich besitze eine gleichzeitige handschriftliche Sammlung erotischer Gedichte, in der er ebenfalls als Verfasser genannt wird, und in der eine weitere Reihe von Stücken, darunter auch die obscöne Parodie auf *Das Mädel, das ich meine* ihm zugeschrieben werden[2]. Die Verhöhnung der Pfaffen in der Schlussstrophe tritt auch in der *Europa* auf, und in der bekannten Priapischen Ode, die ich trotz Bürgers lahmer Abwehr für sein eigen halte, wofür sich gewichtige Gründe anführen lassen.

Doch gehen wir zur Anordnung der Gedichte über. Ein Blick auf die Anmerkungen zeigt, dass die Ausgabe in erster Linie populäre Zwecke verfolgt. Aber von populärem Standpunkte kann ich ebenso wenig wie vom wissenschaftlichen aus der Anordnung zustimmen, die Consentius getroffen hat: Abdruck der 1789er Ausgabe im ersten Teile, Anfügung alles Weiteren in einer nach dem Vorbilde jener disponierten Nachlese. Ich weiss, dass gewichtige Gründe den Herausgeber bestimmt haben, an Sauers Anordnung festzuhalten. Aber sie sind mir nicht gewichtig genug. Was wird denn mit dieser Anordnung erreicht? Der Leser erhält in der 1789er Ausgabe eine Sammlung, die durchaus nicht das geworden ist, was sie ursprünglich hatte werden sollen[3], eine Sammlung, immer auf Strecken hin und jedesmal unter andern Verhältnissen, in andern Stimmungen, unter andern Gesichtspunkten zusammengestellt, zuerst den Charakter einer Auswahl tragend, zuletzt den einer Sammlung *aller* Gedichte, die in den der Veröffentlichung vorangehenden Monaten entstanden sind. Gewiss, sie bleibt ein biographisches Dokument ohne gleichen: aber dem Forscher ersetzt der Abdruck nie den Gebrauch des Originals, und

[1] *Probefahrten*, XVI, 232.
[2] Vgl. *Euphorion*, 3. Ergänzungsheft, 1897, 101, 110.
[3] Vgl. Strodtmann, III, 170.

auf den Laien wirkt das Arrangement nur in *dem* Teile, der die Mollygedichte bringt, womit er ein Dokument von Bürgers seelischer Stimmung während *zweier* Jahre erhält! Wieviel wichtiger ist es auch für ihn, das wahre Bild des *gesamten* Entwicklungsganges des Dichters zu erhalten, um so mehr, als der biographisch wichtigste Teil der 1789er Ausgabe innerhalb desselben fast in derselben Gestalt wie dort auftreten würde! Nein: kann überhaupt eine Anordnung befriedigen, so ist es die chronologische; sie wäre für populäre Zwecke auch darum wohlgeeignet gewesen, weil sie die Möglichkeit bot, alle die Gedichte im Text zu wiederholen, die später eine durchgreifende Umarbeitung erfahren haben. Im Einzelnen ist der Text so behandelt, wie es einem Dichter gegenüber am Platze ist, der mehr als alle andern aus theoretischen Erkenntnissen heraus schuf, und seine eignen geistigen Produkte wiederum zu Objekten solchen Studiums machte. Schon Sauer hatte da die richtigen Wege gewiesen.

In den Anmerkungen, die dem Verständnis der Gedichte dienen, ist der Herausgeber entschieden über seine Vorgänger hinausgekommen. Das verdient als das Wichtigste hervorgehoben zu werden. Man tut uns einen weit grössern Gefallen, wenn man die Quellen nachweist, aus denen die bekannten, wichtigen Gedichte geschöpft sind, als wenn man uns mit Schnitzeln beschenkt, die ein paar neue Verse bringen. Die bibliographischen Angaben wiederum sind mir zu reichlich ausgefallen. Es werden z. B. bei der Beschreibung der drei Ausgaben auch die Nachdrucke angeführt. Cui bono? In Wirklichkeit existieren aber auch weit mehr als Consentius kennt. Ich besitze selbst von der ersten Ausgabe noch Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1781, 1782, 1787, 1788, von der zweiten neben vielen andern die in Antiqua gedruckte und sehr hübsch ausgestattete Wien (Schrämbl) 1789, von der dritten die in sechs Bänden ebenfalls in Wien (Funk) erschienene von 1796-99, die auch in Antiqua gedruckt ist, und chronologisch zwischen die ordinäre Göttinger (1796–8) und die Velinausgabe (1796–1802) gehört, wie ein Blick auf die Einordnung der *Frau Schnips* zeigt. Auch die Liste der Recensionen hätte sich bedeutend vermehren lassen. Aber ich sage nochmals: Wem ist mit solchen Angaben gedient? Lediglich den Antiquaren, und denen braucht man die Arbeit wahrhaftig nicht zu erleichtern. Die bibliographischen Funde, die ein jeder machen kann, wenn er nur das nötige Geld besitzt, sich das Material zusammenzukaufen, die nötige Ausdauer, um das eine Reihe von Jahren hindurch fortzusetzen, dann aber vor allem den nötigen Stumpfsinn, sich mit den Künsten der Setzer und Korrektoren, den Geschäftskniffen der Verleger oder Händler, oder den Schwindeleien gewinnsüchtiger Sammler abzugeben, bringen nur in den allerseltensten Fällen etwas zutage, das dem Forscher nützt, nie etwas, an dem der Geniessende seine Freude haben kann. Freuen wir uns darum des Gesamteindrucks dieser neuen Bürgerausgabe: einer ernsten auf das würdige Ziel des Verständnisses hinarbeitenden Leistung.

Sie bildet einen Teil der 'Goldnen Klassikerbibliothek' worin die alten und bewährten Hempelschen Ausgaben neuerdings umgetauft

sind. Man weiss nicht, ob die *Klassiker* das Epitheton 'ornans' tragen sollen, oder die *Bibliothek*, wahrscheinlich die letztere, nach dem goldstrotzenden Einbande zu urteilen. Wenn der Verleger, sobald die Sammlung abgeschlossen, dann noch das Regal in Eiche oder Nussbaum liefert, wird sie sich mit Recht populär nennen und 'in keinem Hause fehlen' dürfen. Hoffentlich entspricht dem grossen Umsatz dann auch der Lohn für die fleissige Arbeit des Herausgebers!

G. Schaaffs,

St Andrews.

The Malone Society, founded in the autumn of 1906 for the printing of early English plays and documents illustrative of dramatic history, is now in its third year of active life and has a membership of about 215. The Council have decided to exercise the powers granted them at the Annual Meeting last spring, and announce that the Roll of Membership will be closed on March 20, 1910. After that date candidates will only be admitted as vacancies occur and on payment of an entrance fee. Anyone desiring further information is invited to communicate with the Hon. Secretary, Mr Arundell Esdaile, British Museum, London, W.C.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

June—October, 1909.

GENERAL.

Bugge, S., Das Verhältnis der Etrusker zu den Indogermanen und der vorgriechischen Bevölkerung Kleinasiens und Griechenlands. Sprachliche Untersuchungen. Herausg. von A. Torp. Strassburg, Trübner. 7 M. 50.

Busse, C., Geschichte der Weltliteratur. I. Band. Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. 4 M.

Iselin, E., Der morgenländische Ursprung der Grallegende aus orientalischen Quellen erschlossen. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Meillet, A., Einführung in die vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Übersetzt von W. Printz. Leipzig, Teubner. 7 M.

Nencioni, E., Nuovi saggi critici di letterature straniere, e altri scritti. Con prefazione di F. Martini. Florence, Le Monnier. 4 L.

Schlag, H., Das Drama. Wesen, Theorie und Technik des Dramas. Essen, Fredebeul und Koenen. 4 M.

Trombetti, A., Saggi di glottologia generale comparata. I. I pronomini personali. Bologna, Beltrami. 18 L.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Bibliotheca romanica. 71, 72. Le cento novelle antiche. Il novellino. 73, 74. Calderon, El magico prodigioso. 75—77. A. Lamartine, Premières méditations poétiques. 78, 79. G. B. Strozzi, Madrigali. 80. P. Corneille, Polyeucte. 81—83. H. de Balzac, Eugénie Grandet. 84. Boileau, L'Art poétique. 85, 86. Boccaccio, Decameron, VI, VII. 87, 88. Voltaire, Zadig. 89, 90. Boccaccio, Decameron, VIII. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur. XIV. Altitalienische Heiligenlegenden. Nach der Hs. XXXVIII. 110 der Bibl. Nat. Centrale in Florenz. Herausg. von W. Friedmann. 10 M. XVII. G. Bertoni, Rambertino Buratelli, trovatore Bolognese e le sue rime provenzali. 3 M. XVIII. Le romans de la Dame à la Lycorne et du biau Chevalier au Lyon. Herausg. von F. Gennrich. 14 M. XIX. Jehan, Les Mervelles de Rigomer. Herausg. von W. Foerster. 20 M. Halle, Niemeyer.

Latin.

Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum. The Latin Text with an English Rendering, Notes and an Historical Introduction by F. G. Stokes. London, Chatto and Windus. 25*s.* net.

Italian.

Ariosto, L., Orlando Furioso, secondo le stampe del 1516, 1521, 1523, rivedute dall' autore. Reproduzione letterale a cura di F. Ermini. Vol. I. Rome, Loescher. 35 L.

Basile, G., Das Märchen aller Märchen oder das Pentameron. Unter Zugrundelegung der Übersetzung von F. Liebrecht, neu bearbeitet von H. Floerke. 2 vols. Munich, G. Müller. 32 M.

Bertana, E., In Arcadia : saggi e profili. Naples, Perrella. 5 L.

Borgese, G. A., G. D'Annunzio. Naples, Ricciardi. 2 L. 50.

Calabrese, G., Origini del melodramma sacro in Roma. Gravina di Puglia, Attolini. 4 L.

Collison-Morley, L., G. Baretti. With an account of the literary friendships and feuds in Italy and England in the days of Dr Johnson. London, Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dante Alighieri, La Divina Commedia. Vol. I. Inferno. Edited by C. H. Grandgent. London, D. C. Heath and Co. 5*s.* net.

Dante's Convivio. Translated into English by W. W. Jackson. London, Frowde. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Doro, F., Studi Maffeiani. Torino, Bocca. 4 L.

Hasse, E., Dantes göttliche Komödie. Das Epos vom inneren Menschen. Eine Auslegung. Kempten, Kösel. 5 M. 40.

Hutton, E., G. Boccaccio : a Biographical Study. London, Lane. 16*s.* net.

Jerrold, M. F., Francesco Petrarca, Poet and Humanist. London, Dent. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Leopardi, G., Poems. Edited by F. Brooks. London, Sherratt and Hughes. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Marasca, A., Le origini del romanticismo italiano. Rome, Loescher. 3 L.

Masi, E., Conferenze fiorentine sulla vita italiana. Milan, Soc. editr. D. Alighieri. 4 L.

Mortillaro, I., Le figure femminile nella poesia di T. Tasso. Palermo, Reber. 3 L.

Paléologue, M., Dante. Essai sur son caractère et son génie. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.

Ruggieri, N., Maffio Venier, arcivescovo e letterato veneziano del cinquecento : studio storico-critico. Udine, Gambierasi. 2 L. 50.

Settembrini, L., Dialoghi, a cura di F. Torraca. Naples, Soc. comm. Libreria. 3 L.

Tommasini-Mattinucci, P., Il pensiero di C. Cattaneo e di G. Mazzini nelle poesie di G. Carducci. Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 2 L. 50.

Spanish.

Calderon de la Barca, P., La Vida es sveño. Edited by M. A. Buchanan. Vol. I. Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Library.

Cervantes, M. de, Selections from Don Quixote. Edited by J. D. M. Ford. Boston, Heath; London, Harrap. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Goer, Joan, Confision del Amante. Spanische Übersetzung von John Gowers Confessio Amantis aus dem Vermächtnis von H. Kunst nach der Hs. im Escorial. Herausg. von A. Birch-Hirschfeld. Leipzig, Seele und Co. 16 M.

Pitollet, C., La querelle caldéronienne de Johan Nikolas Böhl von Faber et José Jaquin de Mora, reconstituée d'après des documents originaux. Paris, Alcan. 15 fr.

Portuguese.

Almeida Garrett, J. B. de S. de. The Brother Luiz de Sousa. Transl. by E. Prestage. London, Elkin Matthews. 3*s.* net.

French.

(*a*) *Language.*

Bally, Ch., Traité de stylistique française. Tome I. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, II, 3.) Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 80.

Haas, I., Neufranzösische Syntax. (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, IV.) Halle, Niemeyer. 9 M.

Ledieu, A., Petite grammaire du patois picard. Paris, Gamber. 3 fr.

Manz, G., Das Verbum nach den französischen Grammatiken von 1500—1750. Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Kristian von Troyes, Erec et Enide. Herausg. von W. Foerster. (Romanische Bibliothek, XIII.) 2. gänzlich umgearbeitete Auflage. Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Raoul von Houdenc, Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von M. Friedwagner. II. La vengeance Raguidel. Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Dedieu, J., Montesquieu et la tradition politique anglaise en France. Les sources anglaises de l'Esprit des lois. Paris, V. Lecoffre. 6 fr.

Duclaux, M., The French Procession. London, F. Unwin. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gribble, F., Chateaubriand and his Court of Women. London, Chapman and Hall. 15*s.* net.

Gunnell, D., Stendhal et l'Angleterre. Paris, C. Bosse. 6 fr.

Günther, L., L'œuvre dramatique de Sedaine. Paris, Larose. 6 fr.

Hugo, V., Œuvres complètes. Tome XVI. Paris, Ollendorff. 20 fr.

Joubert, J., Correspondance précédée d'une notice sur sa vie, son caractère et ses travaux par P. de Raynal. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Lamennais, F. de, Le Prêtre et l'ami. Lettres inédites de Lamennais à la baronne Cattu, 1818–54, notes par le comte d'Haussonville. Paris, Perrin. 5 fr.

Le Poittevin, A., Un ami de Flaubert. Œuvres inédites, avec introduction sur sa vie par R. Descharmes. Paris, Ferroud. 6 fr.

Montaigne, M. de, Essais, notes par F. Strowski. Tome II. Paris, Hachette. 25 fr.

Musset, A. de, Œuvres complètes. Nouv. édition. Tome v. Paris, Garnier frères. 3 fr.

Pailleron, E., Théâtre complet. Tome i. Paris, Calmann-Lévy. 3 fr. 50.

Pénicaud, L., Histoire de l'histoire des grands et des petits théâtres de Paris pendant la Révolution, le Consulat et l'Empire. Tome ii. Paris, E. Joret. 5 fr.

Saint-Evremond, C. M. de, Œuvres mêlées. Notice de R. de Gourmont. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Heusler, A., Geschichtliches und Mythisches in der germanischen Heldensage. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad. der Wiss.) Berlin, G. Reimer. 1 M.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie herausg. von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie in Berlin. xxix. Band. Leipzig, Reisland. 10 M.

Paul, H., Grundriss der germanischen Philologie. 2 Aufl. ii. i. 6. Lief. Strassburg, Trübner. 5 M.

Gothic.

Braune, W., Gotische Grammatik. 7. Auflage. (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte, i.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 80.

Feist, S. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache mit Einschluss des sogenannten Krimgotischen. ii. M—Z. Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Scandinavian.

Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek. xiv. Hálfs Saga ok Hálfsrekka. Herausg. von A. Le Roy Andrews. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

Falk, H. S., und A. Torp, Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, bearbeitet von H. Davidsen. 11. und 12. Lief. Heidelberg, Winter. Each 1 M. 50.

Feilberg, H. F., Bidrag til en Ordbog over jyske Almuesmaal. xxxiv. Hefte. Copenhagen, Akad. Boghandel. 2 kr. 50.

Holbergs Komedier udgivne af J. Martensen. xiii. Bind. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.

Ibsen, H., Efterladte Skrifter. Udgivne af H. Koht og J. Elias. 3 Bind. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 30 kr. (German translation, 4 vols. Berlin, Fischer. 24 M.)

Islandica. An Annual relating to Iceland and the Fiske Icelandic Collection in Cornell University Library, edited by G. W. Harris. ii. The Northmen in America, by H. Hermannsson. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell Univ. 1 dol.

Jakobsen, J., Etymologisk Ordbog over det norröne Sprog paa Shetland. ii. Hefte. Copenhagen. 5 kr.

Kierkegaard, S., Papirer. Udgivne af P. A. Heiberg og V. Kuhr. i. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 7 kr. 50.

Klein, V. og P. A. Rosenberg, Mindeskrift over Rasmus Nielsen. Udgivet paa Hundredaarsdagen efter hans Födsel. Copenhagen, Schönberg. 1 kr.

Lind, E. H., Norsk-isländska dopnamn och fingerade namn från medeltiden. Samlade och utgifna. iv. Upsala, Lindequist. 2 kr.

Strindberg, A., Werke. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe. iv. 5. Lebensgeschichte. Munich, G. Müller. 3 M. 50.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by S. Lee. Vols. xvi–xx. London, Smith, Elder. Each 15*s.* net.

Jespersen, O., A Modern English Grammar on historical principles. Part i. Sounds and Spellings.. (Germanische Bibliothek, i. ix.) Heidelberg, Winter. 8 M.

Jones, D., The Pronunciation of English. Phonetics and Phonetic Transcriptions. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lounsbury, T. R., English Spelling and Spelling Reform. London, Harper. 6*s.* net.

New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Sir J. A. H. Murray. Vol. vii. O—P. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 65*s.*

Royal Society of Literature. Transactions. Vol. 29. Part i. London, Asher. 3*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Clairson, L. H., The Gest of Robin Hood. University of Toronto Studies. Toronto, University.

Gadow, W., Das mittelenglische Streitgedicht Eule und Nachtigall, nach beiden Handschriften neu herausg. (Palaestra, lxv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 9 M.

Garrett, R. M., Precious Stones in Old English Literature. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und englischen Philologie, xlvii.) Leipzig, Deichert. 3 M. 25.

Gomme, E. E. C. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle translated. London, Bell. 6*s.* net.

Hoffmann, P., Das grammatische Genus in Layamons Brut. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, xxxvi.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M.

Lambeth-Psalter, Der. Eine altenglische Interlinearversion des Psalters in der Hs. 427 der erzbischöfl. Lambeth Palace Library, zum ersten Male vollständig herausg. von N. Lindelöf. i. Text und Glossar. (Acta societatis scientiarum fennicae, xxxv, 1.) Helsingfors. 10 M.

Paues, A. C., A Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version, consisting of a Prologue and Parts of the New Testament. (Cheaper re-issue.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6*s.* net.

Schmitt, F., Die mittelenglische Version des Elucidariums des Honorius Augustodunensis. (Progr.) Passau, M. Waldbauer. 1 M.

Zachrisson, R. E., Anglo-Norman Influence on English Place-Names. Lund, Ohlsson.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Albright, V. E., The Shakespearian Stage. London, Macmillan. 8*s.* net.

Brandl, L., Erasmus Darwins Botanic Garden. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, xxx.) Vienna, Braumüller. 5 M.

Canby, H. S., The Short Story in English. London, G. Bell and Sons. 6*s*. net.

Chronicle History of King Leir, The. Edited by S. Lee. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s*. 6*d*. net.

Creizenach, W., Geschichte des neueren Dramas. iv. Das englische Drama im Zeitalter Shakespeares. i. Teil. Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Cross, W. L., The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne. New York, Macmillan Co. 2 dol. 50 net.

Dierlamm, G., Die Flugschriftenliteratur der Chartistenbewegung und ihr Widerhall in der öffentlichen Meinung. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Philologie, xlvi.) Leipzig, Deichert. 2 M. 80.

Edgcumbe, R., Byron : the Last Phase. London, Murray. 10*s*. 6*d*. net.

Eliot, G., Letters from, to Elma Stuart, 1872–80. London, Simpkin, Marshall. 5*s*. net.

Forman, M. B., Some Early Appreciations of George Meredith, selected. London, Chapman and Hall. 5*s*. net.

Franz, W., Shakespeare-Grammatik. 2. Aufl. Heidelberg, Winter. 16 M.

Gleichen-Russwurm, A. von, Shakespeares Frauengestalten. Nürnberg, E. Nister. 6 M. 50.

Greene, R. Edited by T. H. Dickinson. (Mermaid Series.) London, F. Unwin. 2*s*. 6*d*. net.

Helm, W. H., Jane Austen and her Country-House Comedy. London, E. Nash. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.

Hemingway, S. B., English Nativity Plays. Ed. with introduction, notes and glossary. (Yale Studies in English.) New York, H. Holt and Co. 2 dol. 50.

Hobbes, T., Leviathan. Reprinted from the edition of 1651. With an Essay by W. G. P. Smith. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s*. 6*d*. net.

Ingleby, C. M. and others, The Shakespeare Allusion-Book. A Collection of Allusions to Shakespeare from 1591 to 1700. Revised and edited by J. Munro. 2 vols. London, Chatto and Windus. 21*s*. net.

Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. xlv. Jahrgang. Berlin-Schöneberg, Langenscheidt. 11 M.

Jebb, Sir R. C., Samson Agonistes and the Hellenic Drama (British Academy). London, Frowde. 1*s*. net.

Jonson, B., The English Grammar. Edited with Introduction and Notes by A. V. Waite. New York, Sturgis and Walton Co. 75 c. net.

Kottas, K., Thomas Randolph, sein Leben und seine Werke. (Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, xxix.) Vienna, Braumüller. 3 M.

Lang, F., Shakespeare's 'Comedy of Errors' in englischer Bühnenbearbeitung. (Diss.) Rostock, H. Wessel. 2 M.

Lee, S., The Impersonal Aspect of Shakespeare's Art. London, English Assoc. 1*s*.

Lewis, L., The Advertisements of 'The Spectator.' London, Constable. 6*s*. net.

Magnus, L., English Literature in the Nineteenth Century. An Essay in Criticism. London, A. Melrose. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.

Melville, L., W. M. Thackeray : a Biography. 2 vols. London, Lane. 25*s*. net.

Paston, G., Mr Pope, his Life and Times. 2 vols. London, Hutchinson. 24*s.* net.

Pöling, W., Kritische Studien zu E. B. Browning. (Münstersche Beiträge zur engl. Literaturgeschichte, vi.) Münster, Schöningh. 2 M. 80.

Poritzky, J. E., Shakespeares Hexen. Ein literarhistorisches Kulturbild. (Neue Shakespeare-Bühne, ix.) Berlin, Paetel. 1 M. 50.

Robertson, J. M., Montaigne and Shakespeare, and other Essays on cognate Questions. London, Black. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Saintsbury, G., Fielding. (Masters of Literature.) London, G. Bell and Sons. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Shakespeare, W., History of Henrie the Fourth. Parts 1 and 2. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. Old Spelling Edition. London, Chatto and Windus. Each 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Shakespeare, W., Der Widerspenstigen Zähmung. Für die Bühne eingerichtet von L. Weber. (Neue Shakespeare-Bühne, viii.) Berlin, Paetel. 3 M.

Shakespeare's Plutarch. Edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke. 2 vols. (Shakespeare Classics.) London, Chatto and Windus. 5*s.* net.

Shelley, P. B., Letters compiled and edited by R. Ingpen. 2 vols. London, Pitman. 25*s.* net.

Shore, W. Teignmouth, Charles Dickens and his Friends. London, Cassell. 6*s.* net.

Spenser, E., The Faerie Queene. 2 vols. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 73*s.* 6*d.* net.

Stahl, L., N. Rowes Drama 'The Ambitious Step-mother,' 1700. Rostock, Warkentien. 2 M.

Svanberg, H., Swinburne. En Studie. Lund, Lundstedt. 2 kr. 25.

Swinburne, A. C., Dramas. Selected and edited by A. Beatty. New York, T. Y. Crowell and Co. 1 dol. 50 net.

Swinburne, A. C., Shakespeare. Written in 1905. London, Frowde. 2*s.*

Symons, A., The Romantic Movement in English Poetry. London, Constable. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Theobald, W., The Classical Element in Shakespeare's Plays. London, Banks. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Venzlaff, G., Textüberlieferung und Entstehungsgeschichte von Marlowes 'Doctor Faustus.' Berlin, Ebering. 2 M.

Vries, H. R. O. de, Die Überlieferung von Marlowe's Doctor Faustus. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, xxxv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Warren, T. H., The Centenary of Tennyson. 1809—1909. London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*Language*).

Böhmer, E., Sprach- und Gründungsgeschichte der pfälzischen Colonie am Niederrhein. (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, iii.) Marburg, Elwert. 2 M.

Chuquet, A., Littérature allemande. Paris, A. Colin. 6 fr. 50.

Heymann, W., Das bremische Plattdeutsch. Eine grammatische Darstellung auf sprachgeschichtlicher Grundlage. Bremen, Winter. 3 M.

Kübler, A., Die deutschen Berg-, Flur- und Ortsnamen des alpinen Iller-, Lech- und Sannengebietes gesammelt und erklärt. Arnberg, Paztet. 10 M.

Sanders, D., Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 8. Aufl. Neu bearbeitet von J. E. Wülfing. 1. Lieferung. Leipzig, Wigand. 1 M.

Siebs, Th., Helgoland und seine Sprache. Cuxhaven, A. Rauschenplat. 3 M.

Suolahti, H., Die deutschen Vogelnamen. Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Strassburg, Trübner. 16 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Freybe, A., Das Memento mori in deutscher Sitte, bildlicher Darstellung und Volksglauben, deutscher Sprache, Dichtung und Seelsorge. Gotha, Perthes. 4 M.

Nibelungenlied, Das. Übersetzt von K. Simrock. Herausg. von G. Holz Leipzig, Bibl. Institut. 2 M.

Pfaff, F., Die grosse Heidelberger Liederhandschrift. In getreuem Textabdruck. I. 5. Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M. 80.

Priebsch, R., Die heilige Regel für ein vollkommenes Leben. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, XVI.) Berlin, Weidmann. 5 M.

Roethe, G., Nibelungias und Waltharius. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften.) Berlin, Reimer. 2 M.

Schönbach, A. E., Studien zur Erzählungsliteratur des Mittelalters. VIII. Über Cæsarius von Heisterbach. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie in Wien, CLXIII. i.) Vienna, Hölder. 2 kr. 50.

Schwartzkopff, W., Rede und Redeszene in der deutschen Erzählung bis Wolfram von Eschenbach. (Palaestra, LXXIV.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

Strobl, J., Ein rheinisches Passionsspiel des XIV Jahrhunderts. Eine Handschrift lateinischer Predigten Bertholds von Regensburg. Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M.

Tiedemann, E., Passional und Legenda aurea. (Palaestra, LXXXVII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Arndt, E. M., Sämtliche Werke. XI. and XIV. Band. Magdeburg, Verlags-Anstalt. Each 3 M.

Arnold, R. F. und K. Wagner, Achtzehnhundertneun. Die politische Lyrik des Kriegesjahres. (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien.) Vienna, Fromme.

Behrens, C., Heinrich von Kleist. Bidrag til Belysning af hans Liv og Digtning. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 kr.

Belouin, G., De Gottsched à Lessing. Étude sur les commencements du théâtre moderne en Allemagne (1724–60). Paris, Hachette. 7 fr. 50.

Böhtlingk, A., Shakespeare und unsere Klassiker. II. Band. Goethe und Shakespeare. Leipzig, Eckardt. 3 M.

Bracher, H., Rahmenerzählung und Verwandtes bei G. Keller, C. F. Meyer und Th. Storm. Ein Beitrag zur Technik der Novelle. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, Neue Folge, II.) Leipzig, Haessel. 3 M.

Brüggemann, F., Die Ironie als entwicklungsgeschichtliches Moment. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der deutschen Romantik. Jena, Diederichs. 8 M.

Draheim, A., Schillers Metrik. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M.

Droste-Hülshoff, A. von, Briefe. Herausg. von H. Cardauns. Münster, Aschendorff. 10 M.

Engel, E., Goethe. Der Mann und das Werk. Berlin, Concordia. 8 M. 50.

Eybisch, H., Anton Reiser. Untersuchungen zur Lebensgeschichte von K. Ph. Moritz. (Probefahrten, xiv.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 9 M.

Goethe-Jahrbuch. xxx. Band. Frankfurt a. M., Lit. Anstalt. 10 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Sämtliche Werke. Propyläen-Ausgabe. i. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.

Goethes Gespräche. Gesamtausgabe. 2. Aufl. Neu herausgegeben von F. von Biedermann. i. Leipzig, Biedermann. 4 M.

Goethe, Der junge. Neue Ausgabe in 6 Bänden, besorgt von M. Morris. i. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

Goethe und seine Freunde im Briefwechsel. Herausg. von R. M. Meyer. i. Berlin, G. Bondi. 6 M.

Hauhart, W. F., The reception of Goethe's Faust in England in the first half of the nineteenth century. (Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies.) New York, Macmillan. 1 dol. net.

Havenstein, E., F. von Hardenbergs ästhetische Anschauungen. (Palaestra, lxxxiv.) Berlin, Meyer und Müller. 3 M. 50.

Hennig, K., Die geistliche Kontrafaktur im Jahrhundert der Reformation. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Volks- und Kirchenliedes im xvi. Jahrh. Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Heyer, A., J. C. Günthers Leben auf Grund seines handschriftlichen Nachlasses. i. Leipzig, Dieterich. 5 M.

Hirsch, S., Das Alexanderbuch Johann Hartliebs. (Palaestra, lxxxii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

Hoffmann, E. T. A., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von C. G. von Maassen. iii. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.

Houben, H. H., Zeitschriften des jungen Deutschlands. ii. Teil. Berlin, Behr. 35 M.

Humboldt, W. von, Gesammelte Schriften. viii. Übersetzungen. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Berlin, Behr. 8 M.

Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte. xvii. and xviii. i. Bibliographie. Berlin, Behr. 16 M.

Kettner, G., Studien zu Schillers Dramen. i. Wilhelm Tell. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 M. 50.

Lahnstein, E., Das Problem der Tragik in Hebbels Frühzeit. Stuttgart, Frommann. 4 M.

Laube, H., Gesammelte Werke in 50 Bänden. Herausg. von H. H. Houben. xix—xlviii in 11 Teilen. Leipzig, Hesse. Each part 2 M. 50.

Liliencron, D. von, Nachlass. 2 Bände. Berlin, Schuster und Loeffler. Each 3 M.

Marbacher Schillerbuch. iii. Bd. Herausg. von O. Güntter. Stuttgart, Cotta. 7 M. 50.

MEYER, A., Étude critique sur les relations d'Erasme et de Luther. Préface de Ch. Andler. Paris, F. Alcan. 4 fr.

MORRIS, M., Goethes und Herders Anteil an dem Jahrgang 1772 der Frankfurter Gelehrten Anzeigen. Stuttgart, Cotta. 10 M.

OSWALD, E., Goethe in England and America. Bibliography. 2nd edit. London, De la More Press. 5*s*. net.

PINGER, W. R. R., Der junge Goethe und das Publikum. (Univ. of California Publications.) Berkeley, Cal. Univ. Press. 50 c.

PITOLLET, C., Contributions à l'étude de l'hispanisme de G. E. Lessing. Paris, F. Alcan. 15 fr.

RAUSCH, G., Goethe und die deutsche Sprache. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M. 60.

RÖHL, H., Die ältere Romantik und die Kunst des jungen Goethe. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XXXVI.) Berlin, Duncker. 4 M. 80.

ROSANOW, M. N., J. M. R. Lenz, ein Dichter der Sturm- und Drang-periode. Deutsch von C. von Gütschow. Leipzig, Schulz and Co. 12 M.

SCHNEIDER, H., F. Halm und das spanische Drama. (Palaestra, XXVIII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M. 20.

SULGER-GEBING, E., G. Hauptmann. (Aus Natur- und Geisteswelt.) Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M.

TAYLOR, M. L. A Study of the Technique in K. F. Meyer's Novellen. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press. 75 c.

WEGNER, F., Die 'Christliche Warnung des treuen Eckarts' des Bartholomäus Ringwaldt, untersucht. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XXXII.) Breslau, M. und H. Marcus. 3 M. 60.

WENDRINGER, K. G., Das romantische Drama. Eine Studie über den Einfluss von Goethes Wilhelm Meister auf das Drama der Romantiker. Berlin, Oesterheld and Co. 3 M.

WERNICKE, CH., Epigramme. Herausg. und eingeleitet von R. Pechel. (Palaestra, LXXI.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M. 20.

WERNLY, J., Prolegomena zu einem Lexikon der ästhetisch-ethischen Terminologie F. Schillers. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte. Neue Folge. IV.) Leipzig, Haessel. 4 M. 60.

WITKOWSKI, G., Geschichte des literarischen Lebens in Leipzig. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 M.

WITKOWSKI, G., The German Drama of the Nineteenth Century, translated. London, G. Bell. 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

WOLFF, E., Mignon. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Wilhelm Meister. Munich, C. H. Beck. 6 M.

WOLFF, K., Schillers Theodizee bis zum Beginn der Kantischen Studien. Leipzig, Haupt und Hammon. 5 M.

ZAGAJEWSKI, K., A. von Hallers Dichtersprache. (Quellen und Forschungen, CV.) Strassburg, Trübner. 7 M. 50.

ZIMMERMANN, E., Goethes Egmont. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, I.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.